

FINAL MINUTES

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

October 13-14, 2004

*Siskiyou Golden Fairgrounds, Winema Hall
Yreka, California*

October 13, 2004

Membership Attendance:

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	Glen Spain (alternate)
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Mike Rode (alternate)
California In-River Sport Fishing Community	Not represented
Del Norte County	Not represented
Hoopa Valley Tribe	Not represented
Humboldt County	Jill Geist
Karuk Tribe	Ron Reed
Klamath County	Steve West
Klamath Tribes	Allen Foreman, Vice Chair
National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries)	Irma Lagomarsino
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)	Keith Wilkinson
Siskiyou County	Marcia Armstrong
Trinity County	Not represented
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	Peg Boland
U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI)	John Engbring, Chair
Yurok Tribe	Mike Belchik (alternate)

Agendum 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair, and Allen Foreman, Vice Chair. Vice Chair for next meeting is Irma Lagomarsino.

John Engbring called the meeting to order by reminding members and the public that only five Task Force meetings remain unless there is some reauthorization action. There are a number of things going on in the basin right now; the Ninth Circuit Court issued a decision on the Trinity and deemed that the ROD would be implemented and those flows would go forward. John Engbring also mentioned that some kind of settlement on the PacifiCorp relicensing may be discussed, but it is still in the early stages and nothing has been decided.

Agendum 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance

No congressional staff in attendance.

Agendum 3. Business

a. Adoption of agenda

John Engbring stated that the Task Force will not hear an update on the Trinity Working Group because Doug Schleusner was unable to attend (Agendum 19). Jim Browers will not be present for Agendum 5g, but there is a handout that the Task Force can discuss briefly.

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda.

Seconded by Allen Foreman.

Motion passed unanimously.

b. Approval of minutes

John Engbring asked for comments to the June minutes. Task Force members provided clarification and edits to the minutes.

**Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the June minutes, as amended.
Seconded by Steve West.
Motion passed unanimously.**

c. Budget Committee meeting is November 17, 2004, 10:00 am, Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office

John Engbring invited all Task Force members and anyone else who is interested to attend the Budget Committee meeting in Yreka on November 17th, 2004.

Agendum 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons)

Laurie Simons referred to the June meeting minutes where the motions and assignments are located. She reviewed the status of the motions and assignments and the letters sent since the last meeting. She noted in particular that the letter to USGS regarding funding of the Salmon River gage was not written because the Bureau of Reclamation funded it. The revised Long Range Plan was distributed and submitted to FERC. The draft Mainstem Sub-basin plan outline was edited and is in the handouts for today's meeting under the TWG presentation (Agendum 9).

Agendum 5. Brief Updates and Announcements

a. Update on State coho recovery process (Mike Rode)

Mike Rode said the Fish and Game Commission went ahead with the listing for coho at their August 5 meeting. Coho are listed either as endangered or threatened from San Francisco Bay to the Oregon state line. With this new listing come new requirements for incidental take. Regulations for this should be completed in December. Coho received additional grants through the restoration grant proposal process, which is a change. Populations are being classified differently based on self sustaining or independent criteria. This will also be available for review and comment.

b. Update on NRCS Farm Bill (Bill Gardiner)

Bill Gardiner, NRCS, stated that 2004 was a big year for the NRCS and he would like to review some key accomplishments. Conservation project work is ongoing with private landowners in the Scott and Shasta area. The NRCS received 214 applications from landowners last year and 65 contracts were implemented for on-the-ground work. With 42 projects last year, there are approximately 105 outstanding projects with farmers and ranchers who are doing various things on their property, most water related. Six pivot irrigation systems were installed and there is a continuous conservation reserve program for fencing along streams. The NRCS contributed money with CDFG and FWS to come up with new designs for the Shasta Water Users Association dam to consider replacing the dam with a more fish friendly structure. The long-term goal is to rebuild all of the diversion dams to make them more fish friendly. The NRCS went into cooperative agreement with DWR to do irrigation system planning, design, stream flow gauging and data management. There is also a cooperative agreement with the Siskiyou RCD to assist landowners and we developed an irrigation water management program, which the Siskiyou RCD is taking the lead on. Bill Gardiner concluded that in total, without CRP dollars, the NRCS put \$1.5 million into on-the-ground work.

Mike Belchik asked for a write-up summarizing these accomplishments. Bill Gardiner responded that he is working on an annual report and will email staff the final report to distribute to the Task Force.

Assignment: Staff will email the NRCS annual report to Task Force members.

Some Task Force members raised concerns that there is no real way to determine if there are water savings from NRCS projects. Bill Gardiner said the NRCS is not a regulatory agency. Funding was for on-farm water savings projects and the NRCS won't knowingly put new land into irrigation that doesn't have an irrigation history. Bill Gardiner mentioned that he wishes there were a water trust for projects that save water. He also thinks a lot of landowners have good ideas about how to conserve water but they need help developing the ideas.

c. Update on NOAA recovery planning process (Irma Lagomarsino)

Irma Lagomarsino reported that the recovery team met a couple of weeks ago and are getting closer to releasing something publicly. There has been discussion between CDFG and NOAA Fisheries to reconcile the coho recovery plans for the state and federal Endangered Species Act. The Fish and Game Commission needs to reconcile differences between statutes in order to merge the efforts. That will make it easier for the end-users out there.

d. Update on Klamath Fishery Management Council (Phil Detrich)

Phil Detrich reported that Curt Melcher, the new KFMC Chair, and Council members decided to cancel the October 2004 meeting due to a lack of business to discuss. The next meeting is scheduled for February 23-24 in Eureka, California.

e. Status of Klamath River anadromous fisheries (Mike Rode)

Mike Rode referred to agendum 5e handout (see agendum 5e handout) that summarizes the status of weir counts and the two hatcheries. He reviewed the numbers to date and how they compare to previous years. A point of interest is the increase in jacks indicating that next year's 3-year-old run should be improved over this year. Mike Belchik asked if there was an age comparison analysis done on Shasta. Mike Rode said that analysis, as well as scale collection information, will be available later in the year. Coded wire tag information has been examined to compare spawning differences between spring Chinook and fall Chinook. Mike Rode mentioned that the pulse flow on the Trinity has the potential to move fish migratory patterns around. Numbers on the Willow Creek weir on the Trinity this year are above those of last year, with a large number of coho and steelhead coming in during the last couple of weeks. His understanding is that a lot of those fish are unmarked, suggesting that natural production is contributing to increased numbers on the Trinity side. Based on relationships and past data, CDFG anticipates about a 28 day recreational fishery.

Ron Reed said that the Karuk fishery is a flow dependent fishery and is hovering around 100 fish this year. Fish are going up the middle of the river because of velocity breaks at the falls and there is a lack of water in fishing holes preventing us from catching fish. He mentioned that they are seeing increased numbers of coho.

f. Status of Accomplishments Report (Petey Brucker)

Petey Brucker, TWG, reported that the TWG is still collecting information from the sub-basins. The TWG is assembling a draft of all of the projects going on throughout California. He gave an overview of what the document contains and said it needs to be recalibrated for the reader. The document contains a table of contents, a message from the Task Force Chair, an executive summary describing the Task Force and KFMC, an overview of program expenditures and a summary of projects, an overview of fish stocks, and major challenges to the anadromous fishery. The document will also include a list of each sub-basin's accomplishments and an overview of restoration funding. There will also be a section for lessons learned. The TWG hopes to circulate a draft before the next Task Force meeting in order to get feedback from the Task Force.

Agendum 5g

Jim Bowers could not attend but he provided a handout summarizing the status of gauge funding on the Klamath and wanted to thank Reclamation for covering the cost of the Salmon River gauge.

Agendum 6. Status of Klamath Project continuing operations and Conservation Implementation Program (Dave Sabo, Bureau of Reclamation)

Dave Sabo, Bureau of Reclamation, reviewed how the 2004 water year shaped up and how the Bureau of Reclamation operated this year. An April 1 forecast was used to estimate it would be a below average year type, which has defined lake elevation levels and biological opinions from NOAA Fisheries. If the water year type is changed, the Bureau still needs to stay above the biological opinion requirement. The test line with USFWS lake elevation inflows indicated that a holistic view of the Basin is needed. The Bureau is tying inflows with lake levels to come up with different methodology that doesn't rely so heavily on the water year types. An actual inflow indication can tell us where we'll end up being with lake elevation coinciding with river requirements. The Bureau stayed in compliance with lake elevations throughout the entire season. Dave Sabo showed a graph of the water bank vs. the water year line. In summary, the water bank was very successful this year.

Mike Belchik said that the Yurok Tribe's concern has been with March flows because of the tendency to conserve or reduce river flows for filling the lake. He is concerned with Shasta River stocks because they rely heavily on mainstem conditions. Dave Sabo said they don't know how the water year is going to shape up in March and early prediction could put the Bureau of Reclamation in a harder situation later in the year. He continued that it is a source of concern and the Bureau would like to stack water in the water bank that could be used earlier. Allen Foreman asked about the amount of groundwater pumping compared to the water bank. Dave Sabo said they pumped more groundwater this year. There is little use of A-canal early on in the season when there are strict requirements on the lake and river. The project would have to be shut down until mid-June, so we are trying to find a balance where we could use other means to meet the whole water bank requirement; this issue might be solved through storage. Glen Spain added that another concern is that the aquifer is so depleted that a lot of the water went to recharge and didn't get to the lake. Dave Sabo said he is also concerned with continuing the use of groundwater to meet the water bank. He knows groundwater pumping is affecting the aquifer, he just doesn't know how much pumping is affecting inflows.

Dave Sabo reported that the second draft of the Conservation Implementation Program (CIP) recently came out and the Bureau of Reclamation is holding a series of public meetings. The CIP is modeled after similar programs in other parts of the country and is a basin-wide plan. Stakeholders will make it a success. California, Oregon, NOAA Fisheries and USFWS have helped out in developing a basin-wide approach to deal with all of the issues. Three goals include: restoring the Klamath River ecosystem for recovery of suckers and to contribute to the health of coho salmon, to contribute to tribal trust issues, and to continue sustainable operation of existing water management for human use. The most important aspect of the CIP is to prioritize actions needed to achieve goals and then get funding. There are a lot of efforts but little in terms of money, so the idea is to use the CIP as a method for obtaining funding. The final draft will be out in December 2004 and then we will go through to make sure all comments are included. Dave Sabo listed things that are necessary to get the CIP implemented immediately. They include: getting a publicly existing database, creating an electronic network for communication, convening water quality specialists, and establishing a science review board to look at the needs of different species. For more information go to: <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/kbao>. Keith Wilkinson suggested expanding the area of analysis to include the Klamath Management Zone in Southern Oregon. Marcia Armstrong asked if travel costs will be covered for attendance. Dave Sabo didn't know.

Mike Belchik called attention to page 11 of the current CIP draft and the statement that the CIP will provide programmatic incidental take coverage. He said this is of concern to the Yurok Tribe. The term "unavoidable" is not defined and given recent history, "unavoidable" means continuing with status quo management. The Yurok Tribe is not opposed to basin-wide programs, but it is important to pay attention to such details. Dave Sabo said this statement is similar to the Upper Colorado where USFWS agreed to provide incidental take coverage as long as progress was being made in the recovery of the fish. In other words, individuals won't have to worry about biological opinions as long as the overall program is making progress towards recovery. Irma Lagomarsino said she wasn't sure that the upper Colorado model would work in this basin. Marcia Armstrong said Siskiyou County is working on an alternative structure for the CIP that would have elected officials from each tribe and county. Keith Wilkinson suggested adding Curry County.

Agendum 7. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group

Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)

Alice Kilham, Klamath Basin Compact Commission, stated that the Compact Commission would like to see the Klamathgroup.org site be used as the bulletin board for the CIP. She also mentioned a workshop November 10-12 at the JH Guest Ranch in Scott Valley and encouraged people from up and down the river to participate.

Trinity Management Council

No report given.

Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Alice Kilham)

Alice Kilham reported that the Hatfield group is helping to get the assessments completed in the sub-basins. They are doing outreach and have formed a science group to rank projects.

Agendum 8. Public Comment

Roy Nylund Jr. stated that his concern is with the Shasta River Valley and being able to maintain the lifestyle people have there. He came here today to give input about salmon and river water. He said it is hard to determine what causes salmon numbers to go up and down.

Bill Bennett, DWR, said he would like to let the Task Force know that some folks have come through with gauge work funding. There was a grant from CDFG a few years ago on the Scott and Shasta for materials only and we had to rely on other programs within DWR. As most of you know, there have been huge state budget cuts and all programs used to supplement that work were cut. I sent notices to many of you and some agencies have come through with funding. NRCS will be funding the Scott River from the south and east forks, Mill Creek and Sugar Creek. NOAA will fund the Scott River near the confluence of the Klamath. The DWR water master service is picking up French and Shakleford Creeks, the gauge at road A-12 and a gauge at Parks Creek diversion. The water master is also picking up Shasta at Edgewood, Dwinell and Granada. Bill Bennett acknowledged that the water master program was cut, which would more than double responsibilities to folks in Scott and Shasta and other areas. DWR was able to work with the Bureau of Reclamation to help offset that cut so Scott and Shasta users will see no increase in their bill this year.

Agendum 9. Report from Technical Work Group (Petey Brucker)

Petey Brucker, TWG, reported on TWG assignments from the Task Force. One ongoing assignment is to look at sub-basin planning and coordination. The TWG is finished reviewing plans and can provide feedback. More is needed in these plans on the fisheries conditions in the areas and what is happening with restoration. Another assignment was to review CDFG proposals and provide recommendations. The TWG recommends dropping that assignment and would like NOAA Fisheries and CDFG to provide them with a list of what is being funded so that there is a better understanding of funding in the Basin. Petey Brucker talked about spring Chinook recovery and the limiting factors analysis. He said that document is being peer reviewed. He mentioned the otolith project and how this project will be able to determine if a salmon is a spring Chinook from the Salmon River. Petey Brucker mentioned the recovery plan and that there are limited models to use in developing the plan. The PFMC does have a management plan placeholder for spring Chinook in the Klamath Basin.

Petey Brucker mentioned the big ticket restoration handout (see agendum 9 handout). The assignment was for the TWG to compile a list of restoration projects that were larger than the Task Force could handle. The TWG brainstormed by sub-basin needs, but there is no doubt that some of the items in the handout need to be clarified. Marcia Armstrong stated that she has concerns about some of the items like the need for a Scott River groundwater study; there has to be a better definition of the role of watershed planning. Petey Brucker responded that this list resulted from a brainstorming session and is a compilation of preliminary recommendations. In order to take the next step on some of these items, it would take a lot of planning and coordination. John Engbring added that this is not to be used as a directive to an entity to do anything in particular. This is merely a tool attempting to focus efforts.

Bill Bennett, DWR, stated that there are many other groups in the Basin coming up with comprehensive lists of projects. He cautioned the Task Force in coming up with their own list.

Steve West suggested taking this list and submitting it to the Trinity River group and the Upper Basin Working Group to see if they would be willing to add the same kind of information from their respective area of responsibilities and then we'd have a Klamath Basin list that we could shop around to different agencies. John Engbring reminded the group that the original intent here was to focus on 12 projects so that the Task Force could encourage project proposals. John Engbring said the Task Force directed the TWG to do this and can or cannot use it how we wish. It could be used in the RFP selection process. Other Task Force members mentioned how other

people in the Basin have not agreed that these are the main areas that should be focused on. Other members thought that it was worth sending to the Hatfield Group, the Trinity River group, and the counties for their input.

Some members were having difficulty seeing the purpose for the list. Some felt it was a good way to quantify the projects that were important to the Task Force but that they did not have time to fund over the years. John Engbring asked Task Force members to discuss this topic offline and to be prepared to discuss during the February meeting.

Agendum 10. Ground-water hydrology and management in the Upper Klamath River Basin, Oregon (Kenneth Lite, Oregon Department of Water Resources)

Ken Lite introduced himself as a hydro geologist for ODWR. His presentation will cover what ODWR and USGS are learning about the groundwater flow system in the Upper Klamath Basin and how that information is used to manage the groundwater resource in Oregon through the groundwater allocation process. The study area consists of the Upper part of Klamath Basin in Oregon and California, about 87 square miles. The area around Iron Gate is where the groundwater system changes and forms a natural boundary. The main objective of the study is to provide natural resource agencies and Basin residents the quantitative understanding and tools necessary to properly manage the groundwater resource. A numerical flow model will be developed and used to understand groundwater framework, hydrologic budget, flow system, and computer modeling.

Ken Lite reviewed the geologic framework and said it is responsible for directing groundwater flow. It is used to identify aquifer properties and permeability. Groundwater recharge is estimated through modeling and equations. The study looks at the distribution of precipitation in the Klamath Basin to demonstrate that recharge is distributed in the same fashion. They are finding that the general flow pattern in the Klamath Basin is high to low and north to south. Most of the Klamath Basin is driven by the groundwater discharge to Upper Klamath Lake. There is also discharge through groundwater wells. There are about 500 wells in the study area primarily used for irrigation. Most of the drought permits issued from 2001-2003 are now water rights, so they are primary or supplemental wells. Since 2001 about 70 drought wells have become supplemental wells.

Ken Lite discussed total water year precipitation, the average over a period of record, and the cumulative departure from average precipitation. He highlighted that cycles of precipitation are driving the system and groundwater is driving a lot of the surface water. He showed graphs from different wells that indicated water level elevation change over time due to precipitation levels (all from natural fluctuation in the system). He showed another observation well that showed normal fluctuation from different precipitation levels until 2004 where well elevation dropped due to the increase in groundwater pumping in the area.

Ken Lite discussed groundwater management and described the permit process for new groundwater permits. There is a public interest presumption that has to be made in all cases. The presumption is met through several criteria. ODWR sometimes does grant permits for wells that have been showing decline, but they require that the landowner track the well and report back to ODWR. For more information, go to ODWR's website. Ken Lite summarized saying considerable progress has been made in understanding the groundwater flow system. The study is 18 months away from having a numerical model capable of simulating the regional flow system.

Glen Spain asked if the groundwater source in the Upper Basin is being depleted. He mentioned the Bureau of Reclamation project on flow prediction. Ken Lite said the Bureau of Reclamation is over predicting because the focus is on the kind of precipitation year, when in actuality, it takes a few good precipitation years to quantify depletion. He believes lake levels are low because of the climate system. In his view, what is happening is that water is being removed from storage and it is lowering the water table. If this stress is kept up enough the system won't recover and storage is lost; it doesn't necessarily mean that it is over appropriated. Some Task Force members voiced concern about the increase in reliance on groundwater pumping to supplement surface water use. Ken Lite reiterated that climate drives groundwater.

Agendum 11. Presentation of Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards and Task Force Appreciation Award (John Engbring)

John Engbring stated that we have an Appreciation Award for Joan Smith that we have been waiting to present to her. Joan Smith was a Task Force member for seven years. She always had a spirited way of addressing controversies, and coming to resolution. Representing Siskiyou County on this Task Force has always been challenging, and she met that challenge with lots of energy and positive intentions.

The 8th Annual Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards are given in recognition of work by non-agency individuals and groups in the Klamath Basin for significant accomplishments toward the restoration of anadromous fish. They are given in honor of Nat Bingham, who was deeply involved in fishery issues and was an integral force in the KFMC. Many people that worked with Nat have said that he had a way about him, of understanding issues, understanding conflict, and most of all understanding people. He knew how to look at natural resource management issues, how to have honest differences of opinion with people without being discourteous, and how to appreciate the views of others who come from different walks of life. His contributions helped to bring about the advances that were made in the early part of this Restoration Program, and all that were around then have a warm place in their heart for Nat Bingham.

The first Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Award (plaque) goes to Gary Black, project coordinator, Siskiyou RCD. Since 1996, Gary Black has been working to restore fish habitat on private lands in the Scott River watershed. Not only has he implemented numerous restoration projects funded through the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District, he has earned the cooperation of local landowners and developed new projects and approaches to restoration, including riparian planting techniques, fish-friendly diversion structures, and a local water trust. And in 2004, he also represented the Scott River Watershed Council on the Shasta Scott Coho Recovery Team.

The second Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Award (plaque) goes to Mark Lancaster, Senior Planner for Trinity County. We received an impressive nomination letter for Mark written by Miles Croom of NOAA Fisheries. Mark is the guiding spirit of the Five Counties Salmon Conservation Program, which contributes significantly to anadromous fish restoration by diligently working to rehabilitate county roads to open up previously blocked habitat. Brian McDermott, Siskiyou County Public Works, received a Bingham award in 2001 for his five counties projects in Siskiyou County. Miles writes "It is no exaggeration to say that Mark is personally responsible for the dozens of undersized road crossings that are now being replaced or upgraded, thereby opening up hundreds of miles of previously inaccessible habitat to salmon and steelhead. Perhaps more than the physical improvements that Mark has fostered in aquatic habitat, Mark's greatest contribution is the feeling of confidence that he has generated in Northern California-the confidence that problems can be tackled, that one by one the impediments can be removed, that by recognizing our differences but refusing to be paralyzed by them we can work together to turn things around."

Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Award Certificates of Appreciation are going to many individuals this year. We will be mailing these certificates to the individuals (or if they are here, they can pick them up from Darla Eastman). Ross Taylor is receiving a certificate for his tireless and effective advocacy for the fisheries resources of the Klamath River Basin. He has worked with the five counties process and the Task Force's Technical Work Group.

Tom Hesseldenz and several landowners (Larry and Peggi Alexander, Iwalani Hoagland, Leslie and Margaret Hoagland, Richard and Becky Moore, Stanley and Hazelbelle Moore) are receiving certificates for their participation in the Scott River Dredge Tailings Floodplain Restoration pilot project. The purpose of the project was to reduce erosion of the tailings and uplands, start the process of riparian habitat restoration, and provide an example of a restoration technique that is proposed for the entire 6 miles of tailings.

All the members and their alternates on the Shasta-Scott River Coho Recovery Team are receiving certificates for their significant efforts to develop the Shasta-Scott Recovery Plan. These individuals are: Terry Anderson, Martin Andreas, Bill Bennett, Dwight Russell, Gary Black, Mike Bryan, Greg Bryant, Don Flickinger, Phil Detrich, Jennifer Silveira, Blair Hart, Don Howell, Craig Martz, Steve Burton, R. Howard Moody, Jim DePree, Mary

Roehrich, Curtis Knight, Lisa Thompson, Dave Webb, Robert Barrett, Carolyn Penny, Sandy Guldman, Allie Figura, Gayle Garman, and Jack Miller.

Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Award Certificates will also go to a group of landowners in the Scott Valley. They are Tom Hayden, Warren Farnam, Rick Keller, and Rebecca Schenone. These landowners, in cooperation with the Siskiyou RCD, have improved their diversion structures to allow fish passage and improve stream habitat. We will be visiting some of these projects and hear about them in Gary Black and Bill Krum's presentation.

Agendum 12. The Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program (Mark Lancaster, Trinity County)

Mark Lancaster, Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, said this program started in 1997, with the potential listing of coho, to develop a conservation strategy for salmonids. The TMDLs were coming down the line so sediment was also examined. The elements of the program include: migration barriers, water quantity, water quality, education and training, and avoiding lawsuits. We did an audit of county plans and made recommendations for improving water quality for salmonids and developed a biological prioritization to help focus efforts. A barrier inventory was initiated from CDFG funding where all road barriers were identified and ranked. About 41 barrier removal projects have been completed and a little over 100 miles of habitat were opened up in that process. There is also a road erosion inventory program where potential sediment sources to streams are identified and ranked for treatment and priority of treatment. Other projects include outreach to community groups, trainings for county employees, and road crew education. A workshop for board members is also provided.

Agendum 13. Reconfiguring diversion structures to provide fish passage in the Scott River Watershed (Gary Black and Bill Krum, Scott River Watershed Council)

Ronda Muse, SRRC, said this program objective is to develop fish friendly diversion takeout structures for instream flows and includes many partners. Today we will present the diversion improvement program for coho over-summering areas. Funding was provided through CDFG. She introduced water users Bill Krum and Gary Black.

Bill Krum described diversion dams and some of the problems associated with fish passage and habitat. Four water users agreed to modify their diversion structures using a vortex weir. The weirs are extended across the active channel and are keyed into the banks on either side of the stream. Gary Black described that this concept attempts to make everything work in unison. The weirs are important because stable channel elevation is required before one of the structures is built. Results show that there is fish passage through the weirs and construction is holding, although we do not know the level of maintenance required over time. Gary Black said landowners are constructing their own screens that are reviewed by NOAA Fisheries. Mike Belchik said passage and habitat issues were scoped out in the Scott and Shasta years ago, so he thanked Gary Black and Bill Krum for the work they were doing.

Agendum 14. Public Comment

No public comment.

October 14, 2004

Several members went on a field trip in the Scott River watershed to visit some project sites with Gary Black and Bill Krum.

Agendum 15. An Economic analysis of recreation benefits in the Klamath River Basin (Aaron Douglas, U.S. Geological Survey, Fort Collins, Colorado)

John Engbring gave some history behind the desire to have this presentation given to the Task Force. This report came out prior to its finalization 2 years ago. It was controversial and irrigators were not happy. Apparently the report has been peer reviewed internally and externally and has been released. It is important to hear the information that is out there and folks can make their own decisions on this economic analysis of the Klamath Basin.

Aaron Douglas, USGS, introduced himself and his manuscript (see Agendum 15 handout). He mentioned that people who funded the study hoped to find that a recreation trip to the Klamath River was a trip of a lifetime. They hoped to find that people planned their trips carefully, spent a lot of money, and came from a distance away. Value is associated with a dollar value and to a large extent it excludes other meanings of value like tribal values. Value has limitations but also has advantages in laying out dollar amounts in real time. Numbers suggest that people think about the trip process very carefully. It's impossible to capture the amount of people that utilize the resource 365 days a year and the amount of people who moved here to take advantage of the resource, so value is lost there immediately. Surveys ask people questions like how many trips have you taken to the Klamath in the preceding 12 months, how much money did you spend on average, how many trips do you usually make, and what is the one-way distance traveled. Interviewees were then asked some contingent use questions, which are compatible with travel cost. Travel cost is found by estimating the demand. About 90% of the studies use travel cost as the key independent variable. Total expenses can also be used, but that causes a bigger demand curve and pushes the curve to the right.

A large study sample was extremely difficult to obtain in the Klamath River. A recreation trip to the Klamath River excludes what was below Iron Gate and above Copco and includes trips to the Scott, Shasta and Salmon Rivers. Data was obtained from CDFG salmon ticket sales, so a lot of the information is dominated by people who fish. Surveys were mailed out and we followed up with phone calls (see agendum 15 handout).

Aaron Douglas referred to Table 4 (see agendum 15 handout) and explained how he came up with the numbers. He mentioned a booming consumer surplus due to cheaper goods and explained consumer surplus, revenues and expenditures. Aaron Douglas summarized that there are a lot of people out there for whom trips to the Klamath River mean everything. Economic practices indicate that yes, trips to the Klamath River can't be substituted and people attach a large value to it.

Agendum 16. Presentation from the Klamath Basin Fish Health Assessment Team on the status of anadromous fish health (Petey Brucker)

Petey Brucker said the KBFHAT formed in 2002. The team was brought together to better explain and prevent fish die-offs from happening. The KBFHAT was formed and brought together by groups like the Regional Water Quality Control Board, tribes, CDFG, NOAA Fisheries, and the Bureau of Reclamation in order to figure out how to develop a network to deal with problems in the river. The group has been developing a draft response plan that identifies coordinators in the response network. They have also set up a command system to cover safety and communications, and to identify a hotline. There will be an annual report at the end of the year that will include results from most of the ground work efforts. The group meets monthly to talk about current river conditions and every two weeks there is a high level phone call. CDFG also maintains a portal for information sharing. Mike Belchik added that this group was formed after the fish die-off because there was a desire to have a better plan of action. There was also a desire to take the observations on the river and store them in the realm of scientific surveys. The group has done a lot of community outreach, so the community members have been involved and have been instrumental in alerting the agencies to problems. There is a website and press releases in various papers throughout the Basin to keep folks updated about the river. Steve West said it would be very helpful if info from this group could go out to the public to get farmers to cooperate with fish run timings etc.

Agendum 17. Public Comment

Alice Kilham, Klamath Compact Commission, said that Klamathgroup.org already exists and could serve as the Basin bulletin board that was mentioned in the previous conversation. She suggested linking the KBFHAT website portal and the Klamathgroup.org to make for a great resource. Some of the things mentioned as needs are already available. John Engbring agreed and said that it just needs to be brought together and organized. Mike Belchik suggested some sort of survey to determine what the focus of the website should consist of. Phil Detrich said teaching people about what is going on should focus on general information so that people learn what the cycle is all about and who depends on the river at what time. These things can be done on a real-time basis.

Agendum 18. Klamath River Flow Study Update (Tom Shaw, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office)

Tom Shaw, USFWS, explained that the Klamath River flow study technical workgroup is made up of various entities that meet twice annually to prioritize studies for the river. The group is responsible for planning studies and all technical work is conducted under the guidance of the group. Tom talked about out migration, Salmon River gauging, fish passage assessments, Shasta River imagery, Scott River habitat inventory, fish health assessments, water quality programs, and SALMOD. Tom Shaw discussed fish in the Salmon River and the mainstem Klamath River and the studies to determine if a fish is a spring or fall Chinook.

They are working with the Siskiyou RCD, DWR and fruit growers to get gauges in high priority areas above most diversions in the Scott River to see where the hydrographs have changed and how that affects fish lifestages. Fish passage evaluation of the Lower Klamath River at Pecwan Riffle was prompted by the 2002 die-off because fish were piling up at the riffles. They are taking topographic discharge water surface elevation to model different flows and depths to determine what flows allow for fish passage. A gauge was placed at Ishi Pishi Falls because of the concern with fish passage, disease and subsistence harvest. It is something the Karuk Tribe can monitor for as long as they want. The Shasta River Riparian and aquatic habitat classification and GIS application focuses on riparian classification. GIS is used to determine tree species and the extent of shading and also provides instream classification. The juvenile out migration and fish health monitoring effort focuses on collecting data for SALMOD and coho survival information for NOAA Fisheries and to monitor fish health. Traps were located all over the river to help determine where disease was high May-June 2004. Scott River habitat inventory focuses on inventorying habitat conditions in the Scott River and its tributaries. Accessing lands has been an issue and it takes a while to build trust with landowners. Approximately 80% of the water quality program funding goes to water quality monitoring. A network of sites has been established for recording water quality data. The tribes are helping to keep the instruments running. Nutrient samples are also being taken at numerous places throughout the Basin. There is a contract in place with water quality and GIS experts Neil Armstrong and George Ward at the University of Texas, Austin. We provide them with water quality information and they are in contact with Tetra Tech, the Bureau of Reclamation and Mike Deas to review data and to look at the status and trends to identify hotspots. He summarized that this group is working to develop the best science to inform future recommendations and decisions. It is a cooperative effort where stakeholder involvement is essential.

David Hines, USFWS, introduced himself and said that he works on GIS and database efforts. He talked about the water quality program and hydro lab database and how it is incorporated into the website. Funding comes from the flow study and in-kind contributions from other entities. Hydro labs run May-October and record five parameters every half hour. The database has evolved since 2001 and includes hydro lab, tidbit and grab samples. 2001-2003 data is available at www.aracata.fws.gov/fisheries/tempdata.html. Reports are also available on the site. David Hines continued that a goal is to build a graphing utility into the website as well as an animated video of water quality throughout the seasons. Several members expressed appreciation that the water quality data are being well coordinated by the Arcata FWO.

Agendum 19. Trinity River Restoration Program desired condition and flows and their benefits to Klamath Basin anadromous fish (Doug Schleusner, Trinity Restoration Program)

No presentation given.

Agendum 20. Government Accountability Office audit of the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program (John Engbring)

John Engbring reported that the audit of the restoration program was requested by several members of Congress. The accountability office comes in and looks at the budget, how money was spent and if it was properly tracked. Our budget is pretty well documented, which helped when GAO staff came to talk with us. There were three or four questions asked that he didn't have a good answer for and thought people here might be able to help answer them.

John Engbring asked if anyone knew about the Klamath Act MOA. Keith Wilkinson recalled that an MOA was never finalized because there was no agreement on the wording and once there was a decision made about tribal

and non-tribal harvest level the need for this MOA went away. He believes a failure to come to a MOA was also based on budget issues and dissatisfaction over proper funding. He would like to remind the Task Force that in those days, the Council was negotiating with tribal Council members over harvest numbers. We had an annual agreement for the first two years and then went to a five year agreement and at that time the secretarial decision was made and that might be the reason why it dropped off. A lot of those MOA needs became unnecessary. Phil Detrich said that through the years, there is ample evidence of an operating relationship that has evolved between the parties and we will make that point whether the MOA box was checked off or not.

John Engbring said GAO also asked about matching funds by non-federal sources. Mike Rode said his recollection is that at one time that issue of matching funds came up annually and was discussed by the Task Force. The request was made that Mike Rode coordinate the CDFG in-kind match in the Klamath Basin. He did that for many years and then the request faded in subsequent years because of the big bond funds put forward. It just became a no-brainer that the \$1 million was being matched.

John Engbring said the third question has to do with the funding of projects in 2006 and the possibility that those projects won't be completed until after 2006. The Congressman asked how we will be sure the money is funded and tracked. DOI solicitors said that once funds have been obligated, they have been expended and meet the requirements of the Act. USFWS will still be responsible for tracking these agreements so we'll have to come up with fisheries funds or something similar.

Agendum 21. California Habitat Restoration Project Database (Brett Holycross, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission)

Brett Holycross gave a general overview of the database project that started in 1999 and said that it is actively changing and evolving. Funding is provided by CDFG and there is some support from CALFED and NOAA Fisheries. The goal of the database is to manage the data from anadromous habitat restoration projects in California. Each project is tied to a geographic location or multiple sites per project. It is also used as a tool to track contract and grant data for CDFG. Other goals are to make the data available without analysis and to maintain compatibility with other database efforts. The database tracks participants involved (fiscal and other), target species, project costs, invoices, final reports, and references. It also tracks landowner information, lists of project goals, land cover, and monitoring components. The database can be used for proposal reviews, summarizing trends in restoration funding over time, and using CHRPD data in conjunction with other data sets. Data is summarized for a variety of audiences and requests come from many different entities. A website has been developed for data distribution and as a one-stop-shop for fisheries data. The database can be found at: www.calfish.org. Data can be downloaded and CDs and maps can be distributed by request. The Task Force members were impressed with the database and said that something like this has been needed for a long time.

Agendum 22. Discussion on priorities for funding in 2006

John Engbring reminded everyone that the final year of the Klamath Act is approaching and the Task Force may want to focus funding differently than it has in the past. A Budget Committee meeting will take place in November in Yreka where details can be discussed. He would like input from folks on the types of projects the Task Force should focus on funding. Phil Detrich reminded folks that they should also focus on projects that won't last much longer than 2006 as USFWS will be responsible for monitoring those ongoing projects and the source of the funding for staff is still unknown. He also mentioned the desire to develop an information sharing capacity throughout the Basin and that the Task Force might want to pass that on as a priority for 2006. Laurie Simons said folks have suggested that the Task Force may want to flesh out the mainstem sub-basin plan outline from the last meeting or the big ticket project list. She also suggested possibly hosting a symposium.

Mike Rode said we are bumping head-on with the CIP process and they might be picking up a lot of things we have been talking about here like a centralized information system. Marcia Armstrong suggested doing some preliminary work for that by identifying where information exists. She would also like to see another science conference and to see progress on disease. Mike Belchik would like to see a commitment to help the Klamath Compact Commission create a central website where Basin information can be housed. We need to somehow kick

start that project by applying money towards it. Irma Lagomarsino would like to fund projects that create cohesiveness by bringing the Trinity and the mainstem Klamath together. Mike Lee said he'd like to leave some kind of a legacy and ensure there are good databases out there for folks to use.

Agendum 23. Public Comment

No public comment.

Agendum 24. Recap and Summary of Assignments and Motions (John Engbring)

Next meetings are: February 9-10, 2005 in Crescent City; June 15-16, 2005 in Yreka; and October 19-20, 2005 in Klamath Falls.

Adjourn

Attachment 1

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***October 13-14, 2004
Siskiyou Golden Fairgrounds, Winema Hall
Yreka, California***

FINAL AGENDA

October 13, 2004

1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, Chair, and Allen Foreman, Vice Chair. Vice Chair for next meeting is Irma Lagomarsino.
 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance
 3. Business
 - a. Adoption of agenda
 - b. Approval of minutes
 - c. Budget Committee meeting is November 17, 2004, 10:00 am, Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office
 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Laurie Simons)
 5. Brief Updates and Announcements
 - a. Update on State coho recovery process (Mike Rode)
 - b. Update on NRCS Farm Bill (Bill Gardiner)
 - c. Update on NOAA recovery planning process (Irma Lagomarsino)
 - d. Update on Klamath Fishery Management Council (Phil Detrich)
 - e. Status of Klamath River anadromous fisheries (Mike Rode)
 - f. Status of Accomplishments Report (Petey Brucker, Laurie Simons)
 - g. Status of Klamath River gauge funding (Jim Bowers, USGS)
 6. Status of Klamath Project continuing operations and Conservation Implementation Program (Dave Sabo, Bureau of Reclamation)
 7. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group (Dave Hillemeier)
 - Klamath Basin Compact Commission (Alice Kilham)
 - Trinity Management Council (Mike Orcutt)
 - Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (Alice Kilham)
 8. Public Comment
- Lunch
9. Report from Technical Work Group (Petey Brucker)
 10. Ground-water hydrology and management in the Upper Klamath River Basin, Oregon (Kenneth Lite, Oregon Department of Water Resources)
 11. Presentation of Nathaniel S. Bingham Memorial Awards and Task Force Appreciation Award (John Engbring)

Break

12. The Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program (Mark Lancaster, Trinity County)
13. Reconfiguring diversion structures to provide fish passage in the Scott River Watershed (Gary Black and Bill Krum, Scott River Watershed Council)
14. Public Comment

Recess

Field Trip to visit project sites in the Scott River Watershed with Gary Black. Please form car pools and meet at the designated place in the Scott Valley by 5 pm.

Social Hour at Casa Ramos in Yreka. Have drinks and/or dinner with us.

October 14, 2004

15. An Economic analysis of recreation benefits in the Klamath River Basin (Aaron Douglas, U. S. Geological Survey, Fort Collins, Colorado)
16. Presentation from the Klamath Basin Fish Health Assessment Team on the status of anadromous fish health (Petey Brucker)
17. Public Comment

Break

18. Klamath River Flow Study Update (Tom Shaw, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office)

Lunch

19. Government Accountability Office audit of the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program (John Engbring)
20. California Habitat Restoration Project Database (Brett Holycross, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission)
21. Discussion on priorities for funding in 2006
22. Public Comment
23. Recap and Summary of Assignments and Motions (John Engbring)

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***October 13-14, 2004
Siskiyou Golden Fairgrounds, Winema Hall
Yreka, California***

LIST OF HANDOUTS

- Agendum 4 Letter to Interested Parties from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding Revisions to the Long Range Plan of the Klamath River Basin Conservation Area Restoration Program, dated July 15, 2004.
- Agendum 4 Letter to Ms. Magalie R. Salas, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding Addenda to a Comprehensive Plan Associated with Klamath Hydroelectric Project (FERC Project No. 2082), dated July 21, 2004.
- Agendum 4 Letter to Secretary Gale Norton from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding Monitoring for Salmonid Harvest Management in the Klamath Basin, dated August 30, 2004.
- Agendum 4 Letter to Dr. Sam Williamson, U.S. Geological Survey from Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force regarding funding for the Salmonid Young-of-year Production and Habitat Measurements Project, dated August 30, 2004.
- Agendum 4 Letter to John Engbring, Chair, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force from Charles Groat, Director of U.S. Geological Survey, regarding correspondence for monitoring salmonid harvest management in the Klamath River Basin for Fiscal Year 2006, dated September 29, 2004.
- Agendum 4 Letter to John Engbring, Chair, Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force from William T. Hogarth, NOAA Fisheries, regarding funding for monitoring in support of salmonid harvest management in the Klamath River Basin. Dated October 4, 2004.
- Agendum 4 Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Fiscal Year 2005 Funded Projects.
- Agendum 5e Department of Fish and Game Anadromous Fish Information.
- Agendum 5g USGS Klamath River, Lower Basin, Funding for Streamgages, Federal FY 04-05 from Jim Bowers, USGS, dated October 13 2004.
- Agendum 9 Outline of Mainstem Klamath Sub-basin Plan Draft developed at Task Force meeting, June 23-24, 2004.
- Agendum 9 “Big Ticket” Restoration Project List Recommended by the Technical Work Group. Petey Brucker, Chair of Technical Work Group. Dated October 12, 2004

- Agendum 15 An Economic Analysis of Recreation Benefits in the Klamath River Basin. A Summary of: “Making Unbiased TCM Benefits Estimates with Klamath River Basin TCM and Contingent Use Data”, by Aaron Douglas, U.S. Geological Survey, dated October 14, 2004.
- Agendum 15 A manuscript by Aaron J. Douglas and Andrew Sleeper, entitled “Making Unbiased TCM Benefits Estimates with Klamath River Basin TCM and Contingent Use Data.”
- Agendum 15 Klamath River Basin Water Resources: Balancing Restoration of the Fishery with Sustained Use of the Water Resources for Agriculture and Hydropower. Recreational User Survey used in Aaron Douglas’ research.
- Agendum 15 Trinity River Flow: For Fish and Recreation for Hydroelectric Power. Angler’s Survey used in Aaron Douglas’ Trinity research.
- Agendum 21 California Habitat Restoration Project Database.
- Informational Media Advisory from the Klamath Water Users Association regarding Klamath Water Users Applaud Signing of Landmark Watershed Agreement, dated October 13, 2004.
- Informational Press Release from Office of the Secretary regarding Interior Secretary Gale Norton Announces Klamath Watershed Coordination Agreement, dated October 13, 2004.
- Informational Klamath River Watershed Coordination Agreement.

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***October 13-14, 2004
Siskiyou Golden Fairgrounds, Winema Hall
Yreka, California***

LIST OF ATTENDEES

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

October 13, 2004

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Jerry Barnes	Klamath Technical Advisory Team
Nicholas J. Hetrick	Arcata Fish & Wildlife Office
David Hines	Arcata Fish & Wildlife Office
David Leland	North Coast Water Board
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association
Dave Sabo	Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Falls
Jennifer Silveira	Yreka Fish & Wildlife Office
Petey Brucker	Salmon River Restoration Council & Technical Work Group
Rich Piaskowski	Bureau of Reclamation
Bill Bennett	California Department of Water Resources
Sandi Tripp	Karuk Tribe
Alice Killham	Klamath River Compact Commission
Adriane Garayolde	Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District
Ken Lite	Oregon Water Resources
Brett Holycross	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Comm.
Terry Norton	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group

October 14, 2004

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Ruth Jacobs	USGS Public Affairs
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association
Gary Curtis	Yreka Fish & Wildlife Office
Petey Brucker	Salmon River Restoration Council & Technical Work Group
Jim DePree	Siskiyou County
Jerry Barnes	Technical Advisory Team
Alice Killham	Klamath River Compact Commission
Bill Bennett	California Department of Water Resource
Lisa Thompson	UC Davis
Justin Ly	National Resource Conservation Service
Eric Simmen	National Resource Conservation Service
Jim Henderson	Karuk Tribe
Mike Lee	Klamath National Forest

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

***October 13-14, 2004
Siskiyou Golden Fairgrounds, Winema Hall
Yreka, CA***

MOTIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Motions:

Agendum 3a

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to adopt the agenda.
Seconded by Allen Forman.
Motion passed unanimously.

Agendum 3b

Motion by Keith Wilkinson to approve the June minutes.
Seconded by Steve West seconded.
Motion passed unanimously.

Assignments:

Agendum 5b

Staff will email the NRCS annual report to Task Force members.