

**Approved Minutes for Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Meeting  
February 18-20, 1998  
Brookings Inn  
Brookings, Oregon**

February 18, 1998

1. Convene and opening remarks

Barry: Welcome. We have a quorum (Attachment 1). Since Nat is in Washington, D. C. this week, I will volunteer to chair the meeting if that is OK with the group. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome Mike Vaughan who is here for the first time representing Del Norte County.

2. Business

A. Adoption of Agenda

Wilkinson: I suggest a summary by California Coastal Fish and Wildlife Office (CCFWO) regarding the screw trap operation.

Halstead: No problem.

Orcutt: If Bernice Sullivan is here, it would be good to have a report on the Trinity and hear about the alternatives.

Barry: Could Bruce Halstead do this if Bernice is not here?

Halstead: Yes.

Barry: OK, we will put the report on Trinity River restoration on the agenda first thing in the morning. We are also scheduling an additional agenda item: since we are going to be having an evening session on the Klamath Environmental Assessment (EA) and the comment period closes March 6, we need to decide if we want to comment as the Task Force (TF).

**\*\*Motion \*\*(Wilkinson): To approve the agenda (Attachment 2) with three added agenda items.**

**\*\*Second\*\*(Bulfinch)**

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

B. Adoption of minutes

**\*\*Motion \*\*(Wilkinson): To approve the minutes.**

**\*\*Second\*\*(Vaughan)**

**\*\*Motion carries\*\***

C. Decision on new TF Chair

**\*\*Motion\*\*(Bulfinch): I nominate the Department of the Interior (DOI) representative (Barry) as TF Chair.**

**\*\*Second\*\*(Smith)**

Barry: I want to discuss this issue with the TF. Knowing that this item could come up, I called Nat Bingham. I did not want to have this vote without him, but he could not be here. He said he would support a nomination for me and wanted me to bring this to the attention of the TF. We will continue to work closely in the future.

**\*\*Motion carries\*\***

D. Decision on the report on non federal funding sources (Rode)

Rode: This issue was brought up at the last meeting (Handout provided at last meeting). It appeared that we are not capturing all non-federal matches. The Klamath Act requires a non federal match. Most come from other projects in the Basin. I am not asking for a vote. First, we can go ahead with a broadening of definition of what constitutes a match. The additional California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) activities would be a start (but some of these are drying up). For example, a number of within-the-department expenses are eligible. Second, this accounting would be good to help us get a grip on what other matches

there are in the basin. Other non federal matches should be counted especially if we are asking Congress for additional funds. I am asking the Chair to direct the Yreka staff to account for all these matches.

Bulfinch: There are two problems here. One is to capture matches already underway. The second problem is one of diminishing resources. We need to search out matches for projects which we undertake. At the Klamath Compact commission meeting, Alice Kilham reported that they had gotten considerable support from the Oregon/California Congressional delegations. These need to be considered as a match. This is different from what Mike reported; it is a source of funds from a match yet to come. We need Congressional recognition of both. Second we need to assure representatives that outside matches are being realized to the greatest extent we can. We do not have a strategy for this.

Fletcher: We have a Klamath watershed coordination group. We need to identify projects that are out there.

Rode: We have to get a handle on future matches, but right now we have the request to identify what is on the ground. Each year we could do this. We would send out letters to all parties requesting this information.

Rode: That would be logical.

Iverson: We may be doing this already in the mid-program review by Kier.

Barry: It is an important subject because we have to be responsive to Congress. These matches need to be identified somehow.

Wilkinson: We have been here before. If we go back in minutes, we would see how we dealt with this before. I suggest that we look at that.

Bulfinch: One suggestion for past private lands activities is to go through the Coordinated Resource Management Planners (CRMP) coordinators and Resource Conservation Districts (RCD).

Orcutt: We are a long way from the match and need to have other resources credited. My concern is how to get better coordination between state, federal, and tribal managers.

Rode: Some of your concerns about coordination are broader than what we are doing here. I propose that staff look at the history and, if as Keith says we've been there, then find out. If there are specific guidelines, then staff come back to the TF with a recommendation. In regard to meeting the match, what qualifies and what does not may be a moot point when some of the other watershed restoration money starts to come on line.

Barry: Until we know what dollars shake out, I am not sure there is not a match. So, staff will look at the past meeting minutes and check with Keir to see what has been done, then report back at the next meeting. It is on the agenda.

### 3. Brief review of the last meeting actions/general correspondence

Hamilton: This covers the correspondence which has gone back and forth between this meeting and the last. First is Cindy Barry's letter to Mike Shulters (Handout A) regarding the gauges and his response (Handout B). Then, you have in your package five pieces of correspondence which have gone back and forth regarding USGS-continued involvement in the Klamath (Handouts C-G). There is also a Handout on the Karuk response to the water supply initiative (Handout H1).

For Agendum 13, there is the Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA) letter dated December 18, 1998 and a fax memo from the Siskiyou RCD (Handouts I and J). Finally, for agendum 20, there are the minutes from the Budget Committee meeting (Handout K).

Hillman: I would like Mr. Rohde to give a brief overview of our letter.

Rohde: I would encourage everyone to read the letter (Handout H1). I would like to remind the TF that we have not seen any measurable results of the restoration program. Coho are now listed. I will hand out another map (Handout H2) and ask you to compare this with page 6 of our letter. The irrigation development of Tule Lake mirrors the original dimensions of the 1905 water body. The 1905 map shows the original storage in the system. We were approached by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to look at the first draft of the water supply initiative. We have asked BOR to make model runs (later in today's agenda). Using the best science, we would like to see how water is broken out by water use given the changes in storage in the Upper Basin (UB). The model was developed to meet the needs of tribal trust, Endangered Species Act (ESA), and agriculture. We would expect to see shortages in dry year, not a surprise about that. As a technical representative, I do not have any problem with reaching technical agreement that more water is beneficial. But the structural changes in supply have landlocked the

refuges and now water management in Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake has created a dilemma. There is a fundamental problem we have experienced with water supply since I got involved with in 1992. Within DOI, BOR was to develop the Klamath Project and, many years later, dams. Recently Congress directed DOI to restore anadromous fish runs. We are beginning to see the DOI to do two things that may be at cross purposes. As we enter the late stages of restoration, this may be an important concern.

Russell: You mentioned landlocked refuges. What do you think they were before 1940?

Rohde: The map illustrates what they were like before turn of the century.

Russell: The refuges were landlocked, but by their very own nature. They were landlocked by evaporation. There is evidence of that. You mentioned in the first paragraph on page 3 that water is pumped back into lower Klamath Lake to maintain agriculture and minimal wildlife refuges. What do you mean by minimal? That leaves me uncomfortable.

Rohde: It is minimal in the sense that the water that Lower Klamath Lake receives is limited by amount of water pumped into lower Klamath Lake. Refuges are low on the totem pole. In a dry year, refuges are left with what water they had when winter ended, water is being used by agriculture, and little is left over for the refuges.

Russell: Have you ascertained these problems from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Tule Lake Refuge people?

Rohde: It has been articulated in a variety of forums; by a variety of different people.

Russell: There is some room here for continuing education regarding how the project works and for the real facts. You erroneously leave the impression that we are starving the refuges.

Rohde: Due to the fact that refuges have been reduced over the years, we have heard that increased water supply needs to go to agriculture to ensure that refuges get an adequate supply. It has become a juggling match mainly because of the plumbing. We want to discourage the concept pitting anadromous fish recovery versus refuge management.

Fletcher: The FWS Regional Director Spear has mentioned this concern to us. He feels that deliveries to refuges are being compromised in favor of other deliveries. We made it clear that it is not appropriate that the needs of fish are pitted against the refuges. There are federal obligations to provide for both. Don't use the refuges as an excuse for a failure to meet in-stream flow needs.

Bulfinch: Addressing this through the Klamath Compact Commission is the wrong avenue.

Rohde: I agree. That is why the first name on the cover page is Patricia Beneke, the DOI Assistant Secretary of Water and Science. That's why I say there is a potential conflict of interest within DOI in attempting to address two directives given to them.

Barry: With the goal of keeping on the agenda, I thank you and will make a self motion to move on. The Secretary of DOI is the ultimate authority on this. We hope for resolution. We are at a critical point in water allocation in the basin. Thanks for bringing it up.

#### A. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) gauges

Barry: The response back from USGS to me was a listing of all the gauges and who was funding them; there are no gauges which USGS funds. The point is that we need certainty and a long term solution for these four gauges. We could submit a proposal to fund them to the TF. Are there other options?

Olson: We need to look at how the information will be used in the future by the TF. At a minimum I would like to see us convene a subgroup regarding funding in FY 99 and beyond.

Fletcher: Technical Work Group (TWG) is the best group to do this. We are going through this on the Trinity. We need discussion regarding a strategy to help get agencies to access funds for these efforts. I would like to see information at the next meeting about internal federal agency budget processes so that we can get funding sources identified and look for long term solutions.

Barry: The time is now to be seeking those additional funds from the Hill. Nat is back east to work on this and ask those questions. Those mark ups of committees will happen in June for FY99. There is a separate day or two set aside on the House

Appropriations Committee for Tribal members to seek additional funds and another day set aside for members of the public to seek additional funds. So it is now that those overtures have to be made.

Fletcher: So what can the group do? Maybe we can draft a letter.

Barry: As far as our agency, if I can speak on behalf of the agency, we have already submitted our request for 1999 and it is stable. The Congress=agenda right now is for outside groups to pursue funding for 1999. So for the 2000 budget cycle, our Regional Director has spoken to many of you here about his commitment to Klamath Basin issues and I will hold Mike Spears= feet to the fire and see if we can get at least a Regional proposal on up through the channels in FWS for 2000. This spring is the right time for that.

**\*\*Motion\*\*(Spain): 1) That a letter be drafted from TF to the appropriate committee and subcommittee chairmen in both houses on Congress emphasizing the need of stable funding for the gauges with cc-s to DOI and White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ); 2) The TWG look at the gauges and assess their importance and cost saving and funding mechanisms. (Restated below).**

**\*\*Second\*\*(Fletcher)**

Bulfinch: Is it appropriate for the TF to send a letter to Congress in this regard? We can not lobby Congress directly.

Smith: I sit on the Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC). What we have done is send a letter on behalf of the non federal members of the committee and that is who signs it.

**\*\*Motion Amended\*\*(Spain) I amend the motion to make it on behalf of the non federal members of the committee.**

Barry: Why not fund this out of the TF dollars?

Spain: This is an additional task outside the jurisdiction of the TF.

Olson: In terms of asking the TWG to study this issue, we need to give the TWG more direction.

Spain: I will accept that as a friendly amendment. The intent of the motion is to review the need, effectiveness, and the funding.

Bulfinch: We need to look at what was in mind for collection of gauge info in the first place.

**\*\*Motion Restated\*\*(Spain): 1) That a letter be drafted on behalf of the non federal members of the TF to DOI (and other appropriate bodies) emphasizing the need for long term stable funding for gauges (with copy to appropriate congressional representatives) and 2) the TWG assess the importance of gauges, technical rationale for each gauge, and the funding options. The TWG would report back at the next meeting.**

**\*\*Second concurs\*\***

**\*\*Motion carries\*\***

Barry: Who will draft letter?

Spain: Troy and I will work on it.

4. Update on Klamath Basin Ecosystems Restoration issues before Congress (Staff from the offices of Senators Wyden, Smith, Boxer, and Feinstein, and Representative De Fazio)

Barry: I would like to recognize that Janet Doerr is here from Congressman DeFazio=s office. Welcome.

Jana Doerr: You would like me to tell you about your ecosystem restoration bill. That piece of legislation is handled by Jeff Steir who is in the Washington office and is our legislative director. I can have him forward some information as to what is going on and where he sees it going. It would be very beneficial to Congressman DeFazio if you had comments about the things that he can watch for in Congress this year; what your priorities for funding are. If you have new initiatives that you are working on, I would appreciate having that information to take back to him.

Barry: Thank you. We are going to be working on a letter from the non-federal members of the TF identifying what our funding priorities are going to be.

Doerr: That would be great. Are there other issues or comments or any feed back on fish issues that are going on?

Fletcher: The Endangered Species Act (ESA) is taxing our resources and we have to deal with harvest related or restoration related impacts to listed species. Everyone is impacted. There can't be such a mandate unless you keep in mind the costs.

Wilkinson: I just want to reaffirm what Troy said. The ESA is a hindrance because of the associated costs.

Smith: I am on the board of supervisors for Siskiyou County, and we are in the midst of a planning effort for five counties in California: Del Norte County, Humboldt County, Siskiyou County, Mendocino County, and Trinity County. We want to have a proactive approach so that it does not bring the economy of our counties to a stand still and by the same token comply with NMFS to do what ever conservation efforts are necessary. We have a very small amount of funding from the state, but I don't think it will go very far. Is there a way we might be able to get some funding for this effort? As Troy said, the ESA is killing us.

Doerr: I will put that in my notes. The ESA is going to be discussed inside and out this year. The sooner you can get those comments to me so that I can pass them on, I would appreciate it. I will share them with my counterparts in Senator Wyden's and Senator Smith's office.

Barry: Thank you for joining us today.

#### 5. Summary of Five Chairs meeting (Fletcher)

Fletcher: On January 15th the Five Chairs had a meeting in Redding. Updates were presented on what organizations doing. The PAC was also represented. We are considering adding a seventh and even an eighth chair. In summary, the main concern was funding and lack of it. Monitoring related to harvest and escapement estimates (collected by CDFG) were a main focus. Funding for monitoring on the Klamath is looking pretty poor. Because of the status of reauthorization on the Trinity there is also a question whether monitoring needs will be met. All agreed to make requests to meet funding needs.

#### 6. Mid-Program review update

Fletcher: I would like to call Andrea Tuttle. Before she starts, I am one of the ones who is guilty of failing to respond to Linda Webb about money we have leveraged from other sources, but I will get back to her and I remind others to do so as well.

Tuttle: There is a series of ten tasks (Handout L). As we move through the tasks we have found various stumbling blocks. We do have product for task nine. This has to do with the changes in public awareness on fish and habitat issues. Linda Webb's approach was to look at the number of newspaper articles and, essentially, the lines of type devoted in the various newspapers in the region. She looked at the Klamath paper, the Siskiyou paper, the Del Norte paper, the Humboldt paper and indeed, there has been a doubling or sometimes a tripling of the amount of coverage on fish habitat issues. You can't say that it is all due to your efforts; certainly it is related to listing and water supply issues as well. She has included as one of the appendices, a complete list of the headlines. If you are really interested, you can see what kinds of articles were used. There has also been a draft report submitted on #7 which has to do with the distribution of grants between TF members and nonmembers. Here the issue is whether they are self-dealing with the money. Although we do have the bar chart showing how money has been allocated between members and nonmembers, we are now updating that with the '97 numbers; so we don't really want to speculate on the findings. Now it appears the money is being spread more wisely. On the issue of Task #4, with respect to Mike Rode's issue on how much matching money there is, the approach was to send out letters followed by phone calls and various other ticklers to all those who received money and simply ask them what other funds have they been using? 78 individuals were contacted and the problem is getting people to respond. It takes effort for people to go back to their records and see what there is. We have actually had flat out refusals from some of the people who received money saying, "I don't have time to do that." So we will do the best we can in tracking down that kind of information. Tasks #2, 3, and 6 are very interrelated tasks. Task #2 is the one that is the overarching question. It says "determine the degree to which the goals and the intent have been met". Even though that is Task 2 and had an early due deadline, we are holding off on that and we are approaching together all three of these tasks; the degree to which the goals and intent have been met, the effectiveness of the Klamath Fish and Wildlife office, and degree to which the long range plan (LRP) has been implemented. We are combining a lot of the approach there into our interviews with you. We are moving along steadily with that. We are hoping to finish up with those of you who we haven't contacted yet. Most people seem to enjoy being able to express their feelings on where the TF is going and where they would like it to go. As we go through the process, there were a few stumbling points, one of which was the usability of the data base that keeps track of agreements. The data were not in a system that was very usable for doing searches, so much of our early part of our effort was getting that in shape so that you could query it more easily. Another key stumbling block has been looking at the LRP itself. Like any plan, it is a living document and it simply needs to be updated. It is time to look at it in another way and I am looking forward to your Agendum #9 which has to do with your sub basin and

regional planning. When you get into that subject, this would be a time at which you could look at the step down structure of the LRP that is now in place and see how that can be reformulated on a more specific geographic basis. What I have found in looking through the plan is that the plan is fairly uneven. In some places, it is geographically very specific and in other places, it has some general language. Let me give you one example and it has to do with your issue on gauges. It is very hard to find a specific policy in the plan that addresses issues of general monitoring and acquiring baseline information. Just as a background idea of gathering baseline information and then doing monitoring, it is hard to define a specific policy that you can lump those efforts into. Another example might be when you talk about needs for the data base. It comes under the heading of timber, but what you really need is a data base that covers all aspects of restoration. So the major message here is that we are very much engaged in the project. We do intend to have a fairly substantial draft product at the end of April.

Hillman: What criteria are being used to evaluate the effectiveness of the field office operations?

Tuttle: The interviews are the prime sources of information. We get the information from people who are in the office, information from you, and TWG members who work with the office. The other source is looking at how money has been spent on administration versus on the ground projects, education, or the other categories that are in the LRP. If you have some suggestions, I would be happy to talk with you about that.

Fletcher: Your comments about the LRP are pretty significant. We as a TF don't necessarily have to wait around until the review is finalized before updating the plan. About baseline monitoring; some of these projects areas would be good for us to identify and start to look at.

Bulfinch: At the October meeting, there was an agenda item that was going to give us guidelines on how to proceed to change the LRP. It should be brought up again at an appropriate meeting.

Spain: Andrea, when will you have your recommendations on potential amendments to or updates to the plan itself? Can that be fast tracked in some fashion?

Tuttle: Unfortunately, everything is so interrelated, it is not a discreet task. I would be happy to chat with you separately on that.

Spain: Troy's point is well taken, but it would be premature to do scoping for amendments in the plan until we have the recommendations from people looking into the plan. It seems to me that a lot of the analysis of the plan itself and the updates that might be done on the plan itself would be independent. I would ask you to submit that early while you are working on finishing the other elements, if that is possible.

Tuttle: I will do the very best I can. Let me just refresh your memory that it actually is to be done in the same form as your prior reviews. I believe the most recent was 1993. To me, how much is being spent on administration versus actual projects has emerged as the key issue that you are interested in.

Barry: I get a sense from the group that we ought to refresh our own memories about what is in our plan in order to better equip ourselves when the recommendations come out.

Tuttle: As we meet with you individually, we will bring a copy of the LRP. Actually for those of you who are still left, I am going to provide you with just the portion that is the step down tasks and I hope you can take a look at that before we meet.

## 7. Report on Southwest Oregon Salmon Restoration Initiative. (Mark Grenbemer).

Grenbemer: The Oregon Plan is a watershed health plan. The plan has just been renamed, it is called the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. Why it is just not the coho Plan or the steelhead Plan is that our vision is not just to address the problems that we have with salmon but to address problems that we have with watersheds. Currently right now, the hard parts are with coho and steelhead as well as water quality problems. So the plan as it stands right now addresses coho, steelhead, and water quality through AHealthy Streams Partnerships.® AHealthy Streams Partnerships® have to meet the requirements of indicators in the needs list of Senate Bill 1010. The Oregon Plan can be broken up into program categories: coordinated state federal agency programs, community based actions, monitoring, and finally adaptive planning. There are two main vehicles to accomplish the measures in the Oregon Plan. One is through coordinated agency programs aimed at assuring compliance through existing laws. The other would be community based action which is the main vehicle through Watershed Councils. Watershed Councils are the main channel for doing habitat restoration assessment work. The main idea behind the Oregon Plan is to take a credit based approach rather than a punitive approach. Before NMFS announced the decision on the coho (which affected the north coast of Oregon, the Klamath province, and northern California) the State and National Marine Fisheries

Service (NMFS) signed an MOA. This MOA outlined the areas where NMFS agrees with portions of the Oregon Plan and areas where there was contention. Following the listing, NMFS issued the draft 4D Rule (they haven't finalized the ruling) which recognized the areas of the Oregon Plan deemed as being sufficient (versus areas of contention). Those areas had to do with habitat restoration, hatcheries, and harvest. One of the big concessions of the 4D rule was the habitat restoration. In the 4D rule NMFS defined take and in areas where we really needed to go through consultation as part of the incidental take process were areas of monitoring hatchery progress and habitat restoration. Many of the activities here in southern Oregon that were identified in the South Coast Salmon Initiative were included in the consultation in the take process. After this '97 field season, in order for restoration projects to continue forward without having to go through a consultation process, they are going to have to meet the conditions that are now called for in the Restoration Guides. These Guides have been developed or are nearing completion and NMFS is working with the State on these. These Guides will lay out protocols, procedures and things that restoration projects need to follow in order to be exempt from consultation. The Restoration Guides are only expected to fill in for an interim period. Two years down the road, in order for the restoration to continue to be exempt from the consultation process, they are going to need to be part of NMFS approved Action Plan and the program I am in has just sponsored the production of the draft watershed assessment manual. This manual is then designed to be used by the watershed groups with the assistance of state and federal agencies. This will remain in draft for a year. NMFS will review the draft and provide a recommendation. Our hopes are that at the end of the year after going through a few trial areas, that we will have a fairly good watershed assessment manual than meets NMFS needs and concerns.

A couple of other things that we accomplished is standardizing restoration project reporting. We developed one form that will be used by agencies, landowners, and councils. What we will try to do is figure out what has actually been done in the last couple of years and create a process that has everyone doing the same thing. We are very close also to entering into agreement with the USDA to do a program that is similar to one in Massachusetts that is a conservation riparian reserve program. This program involves direct payments to landowners and we are anticipating enough cost share to protect 4500 stream miles.

Part of the Oregon Plan is a process which identifies high value areas of coho habitat. These areas are called core habitat which immediately started raising red flags to some. The intention of core areas was to be used to help land managers prioritize limited technical resource and funds. What the South Coast Initiative did was use these four areas as the basis for the planning process. Part of the problem is there is so much information available that it is hard to put it out without missing something important. The South Coast Initiatives weren't enough; we go back to 1995 based on activities our Watershed Councils have been undertaking since 1993. Through the Watershed Councils we developed watershed assessments and action plans on based upon all levels of sophistication. But none of them really looked at how they fit into the context of the entire picture: how habitat contributes to runs. Just an example of why that should be important is during the Applegate's assessment process, we learned that the lower 25 percent of the Applegate contributed to fall chinook habitat. What they didn't realize, and what came out of the Regional assessment, was that the 25 percent on the Applegate produced 33 percent of the fall chinook in the whole Rogue basin. In November, the Watershed Councils, agency representatives, and representatives from the Rogue basin steering committee met with representative of the Southwest coordinating council. They got together and discussed the upcoming listing potential. They decided they wanted to try to do something about it. If they could come up with a guidance document that would lay out restoration activities, then hopefully NMFS would take that into consideration in their decision on listing. The Rogue Valley's Council was chosen to coordinate this effort. Phase I is basically taking all of the Watershed Council Action Plan assessments and putting them in to one document. What we then did was look at the four areas that were identified the Oregon Plan for coho and did an analysis of the areas. We looked at 36 habitat indicators for each of these four areas. These four areas range in size from maybe 1/4 mile to several hundred square miles depending on the value of the area for all the freshwater life history stages necessary to keep those fish healthy and alive. We did this in depth assessment and looked at it from a regional perspective so that we identified factors that were limiting in that core area that were of regional significance. We looked at the reasons for cause of the decline, looked at whether the cause was regionally significant, and looked at the current condition of the coho and the habitat in that system. Then we looked at what would it take to stabilize that population. (I am using the term stabilize, not just recovery. The South coast initiative is not a recovery plan, it is a stabilization plan.). Then we looked at what it would take to achieve bringing about the stabilization of these populations in the core areas and then looked at what assurances did we have that these actions would actually done. We then looked at how we monitored progress.

It got reviewed at all different levels, the grassroots level, the agency level. It was an attempt to get everybody's comments. It wasn't just here is a plan, now deal with it. It was to get ownership into the process. So we have this plan. It listed a bunch of things that people could go out and do that would be beneficial to the habitat of the fish. Built into the process was tracking for each limiting factor that was identified which listed most restoration activities that were to be undertaken. With the idea that, depending on the landowner, not every type of restoration activity was going to be desirable. But what this did provide was lots of different options. What this had attached to it was a tracking element with each limiting factor in each project, by restoration activities, by site so if landowners undertake certain activities such as road decommissioning, then we can get an idea who is doing what and where.

Barry: Is that data base accessible? How would we make inquires as to what is being done by whom?

Grenbemer: It's available from the Rogue Valley Council of governments, Water Resources Department.

Fletcher: About stabilization versus recovery, is there an industry or other type of opposition to buying into recovery obligations? Stabilization tells me, you just stopped the patient from dying but that is not good enough. I want him to heal and recover. I heard a distinction there and I kind of alarms me.

Grenbemer: I mentioned Phase I. Phase I is a three phase process. The next Phase is the watershed councils will take this regional assessment and will update the watershed council action plans and assessments based on this information. The third phase will be that we will take the updated action plans and assessments and come back to the Council of governments to aggregate all of them into a South Coast Action Plan Assessment. That will be the end product.

Olson: Will the recovery plan address target conditions that you want to see on these subbasins?

Grenbemer: Yes, that is part of the reason that it is worked into the short term vision. It is hoped that the Watershed Council process in updating their Action Plan Assessments will come up with desired future conditions.

Barry: Thank you very much for coming.

#### 8. Status report - 1998 annual operations plan and EIS on BOR Klamath Project by the Klamath Falls BOR. Carl Wirkus.

Wirkus: The 1998 draft operations plan that the DOI has put together was issued in draft on February 4th for public comment. They are requesting the comments come in by March 6th and there will be a public meeting here in this room tomorrow night at 6:30 PM. It will be a workshop style public meeting. The DRAFT analyzes three operational alternatives. The third alternative, alternative one, you will find is quite similar to the 1997 operations plan including lake levels. As an adjunct to that, as of yesterday, the snow pack was sitting in the Klamath Basin was about 104 percent of average. Upper Klamath Lake is at elevation 4142 and holding there for flood control purposes. The Irongate Dam (IGD) release is approximately 3,500 cfs.

##### A. Explanation of Two Requested Model Runs.

We have got eight sheets of paper and they are model runs in four different scenarios, so there are two sheets of paper for each scenario (Handout M). On the front page, in the upper right hand corner is a box that just tells you what the flow target was, what that corresponds to in our computer shorthand is the flow schedule that was laid in the Trihey report. On the left hand side, it says Klamath Adjudication for Lake Level Targets. That is not wholly accurate. Actually the lake targets that are contained in Alternative A in the operations plan, just in shorthand, they are the lake at elevation 4143 in April through June, elevation 4142 through July, with a minimum elevation of 4141. Turn back two pages and you will see that the flow target stays the same with the Trihey flows. The Upper Klamath Lake target then takes on the Upper Klamath Lake elevations that are in Alternative I in the draft EA and those are the critical elevations there a minimum elevation of 4141.6 on July 15th and an end of September elevation of 4139. Get into the busy box and you'll have a small box that has three notations in it. One says UKL storage reset. That is a feature of the model. It is set up so we can either use it as a one year model where we reset the lake elevation with what we have currently projected for the single year or in this case, when it was in accumulative basis for the carryover the lake elevation, the ending lake elevation from the previous year. In this example, we have Lost River off which means that we are not bringing water supplies out of the Clear Lake River system. Then it says "use as forecast inflow". What you have here is perfect hindsight where the model uses what actually occurred as inflow. If you use this mode, then it goes into a what would happen if you used the forecast inflow and set the minimums and went through the year. You see the difference there as we go down further. Drop down to the next little box that has got some more words in it and go clear to the bottom. All this model takes into account is the April through September period. The refuge demand is from the ADY canal system to maintain permanent wetlands on Lower Klamath Refuge. The filled in triangle is the simulated irrigation demand. Those are based on early season precipitation trigger that seems to hold pretty consistently with what has occurred in the past. You can see why that is important is you look across the graph where you find those triangles and you can see that amount varies. It has been shown to historically vary depending on hydrological conditions for the year. Still moving up that row, the 'X' is what the forecast was on April 1 of that year (percent exceedance level). The filled in circle, is the actual inflow. You can see the difference between what was forecast and what occurred. The black bar represents water supply that would not be available to the ADY canal under this set of conditions in perfect hindsight operations. The dotted bar is Agricultural supplies that are not available. Second page - goes with each scenario and is a busy page full of numbers. The important thing there is if you have a number that is not in parentheses, that is a positive number, that is additional flow. That is the flow amount below IGD would be greater than the target by that amount. Where it is zero, you are right at the target. Where it is in parentheses, that means that you have shut off the refuge and agriculture supplies and, because of lake level minimums, we still don't have enough water to meet flow target minimums. The way the model is set up, it meets the lake target first, the river target second, then the ag and refuge. Something to note about refuge supplies in the fall; about any time (we don't really have full data to

back this up yet) you see the shortage bars come up for the, the April through September period, it is very likely that there won't be return flows that will go to Lower Klamath in sufficient amount to meet refuge demands there. Part of that is because meeting minimums (lake and stream flow). Part of that is because you have depleted some of those permanent marshes through not having supplies available through the ADY system.

Olson: What were the alternatives developed from?

Wirkus: A variety of information that has been received over the last few years.

Olson: So that included other federal agencies like NMFS?

Wirkus: Yes.

#### B. Relation to December '98 Water Advisory

Fletcher: The Tribe was part of the Inter Disciplinary Team (IDT) that was put together to analyze alternatives. The group needs to understand that IDT didn't really receive any information to support the flow criteria that were developed. We were just given numbers and we had no biological information on how those numbers were developed. So we had somebody (and we are still not clear whether it was the management team, Patricia Beneke or Bruce Babbitt himself) coming up with numbers. Those numbers were passed down through the system utilizing the Klamath Project Operation Plan Model (KPOPSIM) and then we were asked what is the impact to the fishery resources. We couldn't assess that impact in a reasonable way because we had no supporting documentation to go back through, no biological justification or technical justification. The only flows that I could see that are justified were the ones that we and the Karuk Tribe put forward because I know what those were based on. Where did the BOR alternatives come from? It is difficult for any reviewer to make an informed comment not knowing how those alternatives were truly developed.

Wirkus: We do face the dilemma of water rights that guide the management of the system and that run all the way through from the reserve water rights, the treaty water rights, to refuge water rights. So in working through that priority system and working toward alternatives that you would analyze the impacts of, these flows were considered reasonable in the process.

Barry: Any other questions or comments on the EA or these model runs?

Olson: You said that there were three alternatives. You ran all three?

Wirkus: The runs are in the EA. These particular runs were specifically requested at the last TF meeting.

#### Public comment

Rohde: Could everybody please turn back to page six of the letter that I described to your earlier (Handout H1). This is an illustration that is part of the Klamath Plan and as I tried to describe earlier, prior to the turn of the century. The top map illustrates basically the capacity of the Klamath River basin and the Upper Klamath River basin to hold water. The lower half illustrates basically the DOI's implementation of Congressional mandate to modify that holding capacity for other uses. The Tribes have consistently asked that the DOI articulate what would be the impact if they lived up to their requirements to meet the needs of Tribal Trust and endangered species first. Due to our difficulties in getting a formal response, we asked at the last TF meeting, to generate these model outputs which you have before you. Unfortunately, I had to initiate the request in a public forum in order to get this kind of a response. This is our first opportunity to see the results. It is going to take a while for us to digest all of this. But what we see before us is that the tribal trust water levels that we requested be modeled are not part of the alternative process. Part of my request was also for Carl to describe how the results of those model runs were incorporated into their development of the preferred alternative for this EA. There are no alternatives that address Tribal Trust water levels that we specifically articulated and we don't see any significant changes to date.

Spain: I have seen lots of models based on assumptions that haven't been ground tested. Have you internally checked your model and what is being done to make sure your model actually is realistic?

Wirkus: Yes, we have. There were both calibration and verification runs that have been done that we presented a couple of times in a couple of forums. The model is dynamic and still evolving. It has a number of different modes and it is the forecast

mode that we used to develop the 1997 operations plan. It was remarkable how close the water year went to the forecast model predictions.

Spain: I would request that you supply the TF with the verification and model run data that shows how it internally operates.

Wirkus: The model has been sent out to a number of requesters just recently with documentation. I am not sure that it has all of the verification, calibration, documentation with that. We can supply that. We also tend to post the models to a web site, so once we get it right protected, anyone can have it to open it up and do whatever you please.

Barry: Just send it to Yreka. They will make sure it gets distributed.

Rohde: What the model runs are, is a historic hydrograph of how water comes into the system on an annual basis. The Yurok Tribe applied the FWS method to scientifically determine what would the necessary flows be to provide optimum conditions for anadromous fish in the Klamath River basin. I remind all the TF members that the Klamath Act Legislation specifically articulates that its goal is to restore anadromous fish to optimum levels by the year 2006. We are not gaining ground right now. So, the Yurok flows are utilizing an established FWS method (based on 60 percent flows down river) to determine once those are provided, what impact that would have on all the other current existing water delivery systems.

The Karuk tribe's modification of that is redistributing some of that 60 percent across through the spring and summer when the 60 percent eventually dips below FERC minimums. We evened that out for maintaining ecosystem health throughout the summer. That is what the requested models were. These are the results. Part of my specific request as a TF member was, given that these are the model runs that we are requesting, you have a Trust responsibility to recognize; how did you factor in those results in your ultimate decision as you prepared the EA? Were they factored in at all? Were they thrown out and disregarded? What merit did they have in your decision making process, Carl?

Wirkus: I am going to be very unsatisfying with my response in that I suggest that you submit that in writing as a comment to the draft EA and it will be addressed appropriately. I am not the appropriate individual to address that.

#### C. \$250K from BOR for Klamath Restoration Program.

Wirkus: This is apparently the result of my boss attending the Six or Seven Chairs meeting and making a commitment that BOR would provide additional funding to do work on the Klamath River this year. I think it is a very good commitment and I agree with it completely and we are working on finding the money now. We are now in the process of trying to reprogram funding in to the Klamath Basin area office budget. We only have a certain amount of latitude with our appropriated budget this year and it is a fairly small percentage of all of our annual budget. It turns out our appropriation percent for 1998 was inadequate as developed two years ago. We are approaching Congress for their approval for a substantial increase so the timing on having those funds available through the Klamath area office budget is at the earliest sometime in June.

Barry: How would it be administered?

Wirkus: We would target the next priority projects to be funded on the TF priority list. We want to look and make sure that we were accomplishing BOR program objectives to do that. The other issue is whether or not the funding is administered through the field office. The overhead that would be charged against that projects if it goes through the FWS would be very substantial and wasn't anticipated. We need to see some pretty good justification for this overhead.

Bulfinch: A certain amount of that funding ought to be for the stream gauges.

Fletcher: The TWG would be best to come up with recommendations on where the dollars should go. Last year, there weren't as many projects submitted to the TF; there are few good proposals to choose from if you go down the list. The TWG is in the process of wrapping up the flow scoping exercise and that certainly will identify some priorities there that maybe this money can be devoted to.

Barry: If you say that you won't know until June about the availability of the funds, can't you consider new FY 99 proposals for funding? That might address this issue if we put gauges in as projects?

Smith: I would agree with Kent and I'd certainly take into consideration what Troy said as well however, I want to caution this group that it is our decision on what projects are funded, not the TWG-s.

Barry: I think that is the understanding, isn't it, Troy?

Fletcher: Yes, all I am saying is let's not start running down the road of dividing up something before we are sure what the options are.

Barry: Would it be alright with BOR if we just put the \$250,000 in, and let our projects rank out as they will rather than have it be left up to BOR to pick and choose from the unfunded projects?

Wirkus: I'd like to look at that as the first cut of where the money goes. Ultimately, we also need to make sure that it is consistent with responsibility and authority of BOR to fund those projects. There may be projects that wouldn't fit. We will ultimately make that decision but I do intend to generally honor the priorities of the TF.

Barry: It is great that BOR has made the offer as long as the projects have been forwarded by the TF and then the BOR would choose from that list. Does the TF concur ?

Wirkus: We have received a preliminary list of the projects from Mr. Bingham.

Barry: Those were last year's projects. The unfunded from '98.

Orcutt: This came out in the 5 Chairs meeting. My understanding was that was in response to the CDFG's request for funding for harvest monitoring.

Wirkus: That is correct. That brings to mind that the first cut on the funding was for CDFG monitoring escapements, then the funding that remained out of the \$250,000, as I recall, would go to about five projects.

Rode: I have heard rumors that the \$250,000 has been increased to \$460,000, that there might be some additional money available the following year, then as much as a million in the year 2000 above and beyond the normal TF annual budget. The important thing is that we don't want projects funded outside the purview of the TF that run counter to TF priorities and direction. We have had a little bit of that happen in the past, it creates a lot of confusion, and infighting. I would ask that whatever the BOR comes up with, whether it is administered or not through the Yreka Office, that priority consideration be given to what the TF ranks as being most important.

Wirkus: I do think it is important that we honor the process to the extent that we can. There are and there will continue to be other things going on that sometimes may drive us out of there. One that I can think of is that we are entering into consultation with NMFS on effects to coho salmon.

Barry: We do have an issue with overhead funding with the FWS that we can't get away from. It is an internal Service policy without any exceptions. That is an issue for the TF consideration. I want to talk about that because I would like to get a decision on that. Can we decide upon who should administer that money? Should it be BOR or should it come to the FWS Yreka office?

Hillman: It sounds like you are saying that this money if it were to run through the FWS office in Yreka, that there would be an overhead rate that is set by policy and unavailable?

Barry: Yes, that is the cost of doing business. That is an administrative policy and maybe Ron can address this specifically.

Hillman: Maybe that is an internal FWS policy that is hard and fast but in the case of dollars being brought into a program from sources other than FWS to apply that unwavering overhead would seem unreasonable. We have had this discussion before amongst the budget subcommittee; we have had the discussions in open session here amongst the TF on many occasions. The entire restoration program budget looks pretty ugly when we look at what it costs to administer a million dollar program. The argument that has been forwarded time and time again to us has been that it looks like it is top heavy but it wouldn't matter if it was \$1 million or \$20 million, it still requires that same level. We have been assured that if we were able to bring in additional resources to the program that overhead would remain fairly constant from what it is at current. It seems fairly unreasonable to me, too. Maybe we ought to be looking for somebody else to administer the restoration program if that be the case because it seems like that is a major road block to moving forward with what we are charged to do.

Bulfinch: Until we get some coloring of the \$250,000, I think we are premature in deciding how we are going to administer it.

Russell: As overhead on Section 5 of our budget (Handout K), I understood you to say that this is a hard and fast \$80,000 that is not going to be forgiven. Is that right?

Barry: I was simply bringing up the overhead issue which related to the gift from BOR as to whether BOR should administer the work or the FWS.

Russell: Then can the BOR run the program for less overhead than FWS? If you did, could we at least be assured that the Klamath Project wouldn't be charged part of that as overhead?

Wirkus: You won't write another check for us if you haven't already. Yes, I do believe it. You end up with five of six agreements. I think that I can administer it out of existing staff.

Barry: I only raised this issue because it is their money. It is not the million that comes from the FWS for purposes of this work group. The \$250,000 is a gift and that is why I am raising the issue as a possibility that they could administer it; we wouldn't have to spend the overhead that the FWS requires. Would BOR require an overhead out of it?

Wirkus: Last year when we helped with the funding for CDFG, what we ended up doing was purchasing some tags and got the whole amount of money into the projects. I believe that we could do it and probably get the entire amount on the ground. I may have staff angry with me for saying that.

Spain: Will you please supply a copy to the TF members when you get Congressional approval for the \$250K?.

Wirkus: If that is appropriate. I believe that I can do that.

Spain: I am very concerned about not working across purposes. I think we have a limited amount of funds, limited amount of resources and we have to be very careful with targeting those things. So I really appreciate your comments that you intend to work with the TF and its priorities.

#### 9. Recommendations on strategic restoration and subbasin planning updated (Rohde)

Rohde: The subbasin planning members are a subcommittee of the TWG so when we come up with things we work it back up through the TWG then present it back to the TF. At the last TF meeting we submitted an outline of how plans from each subbasin would look so they are consistent. The TF approved the outline and passed it on to the CRMPs, suggesting that they could follow that outline for their subbasin plans. The next meeting is in April. We have copies of draft subbasin plans and will distribute them to the members of the subcommittee. Then we're going to do what we had always hoped we would be able to do. That is in sync with the subbasin planning efforts so that as we enter the Request for Proposals (RFP) process the next year we can hone in on the kinds of restoration efforts we all agree need to be done.

Unfortunately we are not there yet. We have come up with a methodology of how the plans can be developed, the CRMPs are well under way in their planning efforts, and we're going to actually look at what they've been coming out with this spring. Meanwhile, we have a strategic planning process. And the same group sits down and is trying to follow the TF directives that the subbasin planning process would be tiered to a strategic planning process that looks at the basin as a whole. This identifies what's going on in the basin and what the concerns with anadromous fish are in the basin. Early on this year we broke up into mini committees and we had people look at the FEMAT process which is referenced in the TF directives, we had people take a look at the LRP, and the Oregon planning. So we asked each of the committee groups to summarize those three efforts and we've done that. We're trying to tier our planning to all of the ongoing efforts that were responsible for trying to fit within.

After this meeting the FWS will release to the public the new RFP. Proposals will be distributed to the TWG for ranking and hopefully be forwarded on again to the TF for final approval and funding. We identified in our planning a glitch in the RFP process that I'm going to describe right now. The first table that I'm handing out is Table one (Handout N, draft, side 1) that is in the RFP packet that has been going out with the RFP every year. It was an attempt by the TWG early on to try to give the proposers some guidance as to what might be priorities for restoration. The TWG has struggled over the years with the kinds of proposals that we receive and it has always been the intent of the TWG to help guide the effort by honing in on the types of restoration that we think is needed to help the proposer focus their efforts. Throughout the years we have noticed that Table one is pretty broad and as a result we weren't really getting what we were hoping for all of the time. So what we decided in the subcommittee was to go ahead and try a different approach. That's what the FY 99 priority objectives table is (Handout N, draft, side 2). It's the subcommittee's attempt to modify the matrix patterned after the changes that the TF has made in its funding categories. We have categories 1, 2, and 3 which is the way that money is currently distributed by the TF. We decided to use the same notation as the TWG was using in its instream flow scoping the TWG actually came up with the x's and the ?'s and the ~'s. We first provided the matrix with the boxes empty to each of the subbasin coordinators, and based on their knowledge of each of their subbasins, they filled in the data in each of the subbasins for the lower, mid, Salmon, Scott, and Shasta. Then the TWG filled in the column under main stem. They also modified the original matrix a little bit by dropping the basin wide on the previous table and dropping the upper Klamath because historically projects haven't been funded in the upper

Klamath pending approval of the Upper Basin Amendment (UBA). So we're recommending this matrix replace the old Table one in the RFP that would go out after this TF meeting.

#### 10. TF Discussion

Orcutt: Under category 1D, could you elaborate on law enforcement?

Rohde: The law enforcement came in as a concern for poaching and stayed in there through the process. It was discussed by the TWG and stayed there.

Fletcher: Harvest management is the first thing that popped out to me. Could we get some definition about this? The only people that put this down were on the Scott and Shasta. Are they talking about harvest management in their own subbasins or elsewhere?

Rohde: The back of the old table had definitions, but I don't have that here. I would have to confer and get back to you.

Belchik: The intent was to fill in within your own subbasin.

Barry: Do you know what the definition is of harvest management on the new Table one?

Olson: Did the group provide the definition when they filled in the boxes?

Rode: I take it to mean they identified harvest management as problem for stocks for that basin. The problem I am having is priority objectives related towards funding in these various subbasin. What would you suggest that they propose for funding for, say, harvest management and law enforcement? I see them as limited in terms of what could be paid for by the TF.

Fletcher: I want to express my concern about this table. These are problems identified by the various subbasins and do not necessarily reflect priorities for proposals. They need to take a look at their own back yard.

Spain: There are plenty of agencies dealing with harvest management if by that you mean research to better manage. I can't imagine the TF funding Law enforcement. But overall this is a good effort and easier to understand.

Orcutt: Where should sensitive stocks fit in? On the 1998 table, sturgeon are included. We need to include species other than salmonids.

Rode: I would add that to Fish Population, D.

Farro: We have injected something confusion here; it would be less confusing to replace funding is justified with identified needs.

Vaughan: I am confused about the table and what it is used for. It is supposed to give proposers an idea of where our priorities are, yet at the same time people have said it is not a priority list. The Form itself seems to be limiting unless we all agree that these are the things needed to be done.

Farro: The real confusion is saying these are fiscal year priorities; if these were priorities they would be numbers instead of X's and question marks. I could go with this Table if we say that is identified needs for proposers to consider within the overall scope of the program. If we try to go beyond that with this, it is not here; we are creating more than is on this paper.

#### 11. Public Comment

None

#### 12. Decision on strategic restoration and subbasin planning

Barry: What I heard was this table should be changed so that X is indicative of a problem (Identified Need) and we take out reference to funding. Then we wanted to delete harvest management because we figured this is something that people would not propose anyway. What about law enforcement?

Olson: If anywhere, law enforcement has been an issue on the Salmon. Why didn't it show up Bob?

Rohde: Because the coordinators feel they have it controlled now and they deleted it as a priority.

Vaughn: If you get rid of harvest management and law enforcement under D, the only thing that will end up there will be hatchery practices.

Barry: I thought we were going to add sensitive species.

Rode: No, I wanted those highlighted or identified in the descriptive write up saying emphasis is to be given to projects intended for sensitive species recovery. Law enforcement, lets just drop it.

Rohde: OK.

Spain: Under D if you just say Ahatchery practices@, it would simplify this.

Hillman: A proposal to operate a small scale hatchery in the mid-Klamath subbasin, where would that fit, under D, hatchery practices?

Barry: Yes. That's marked with an X under mid-Klamath. With that last change is there any other thing that needs to be inserted? Bob, please make the changes and bring it back. We will bless it when it comes back.

Rohde: What happens to sensitive stocks?

Rode: I propose that we identify what those species are, but these are all action items pertaining to all species. If we wanted to up-front give special consideration to sensitive species in all regards, we could.

Bulfinch: The sensitive species you are speaking of are non salmonids.

Farro: There are not priorities.

Barry: Take out the words Apriority objectives@ in the title and substitute Aidentified project needs@.

Rohde: OK.

Barry: OK, I think we are done (Handout N, Final).

February 19, 1998 (a quorum was present)

#### Added Agenda Item #1

Halstead: (Handout O) On the Klamath side, the out migrant index was down 58 percent from the average. Coho and steelhead smolts were down 61 percent but the percentage of naturals was up 81 percent. In absolute terms, there are still small numbers of coho. On the Trinity side it was a mirror image of the Klamath. Steelhead smolts were down 13 percent. Last year the fish experienced extreme water temps in both rivers. Our crews recovered dead fish in the Klamath. We observed high water temperatures. DO readings were below lethal limit. There was no die off on the Trinity. I hope this is useful. If you have questions I will be around.

#### Q/A

Wilkinson: Would you make this sort of presentation to the KC in Eureka?

Halstead: Yes.

Rode: You thought the January flood might be the dominant cause for the decline in numbers of out migrants. But looking at the Klamath side and the relative decrease of hatchery versus natural, it almost looks like the decrease on the Klamath side might be due to the extreme conditions which caused the fish kill. Because the hatchery fish were protected in the hatchery during the period when the flood occurred, yet their numbers seemed to decrease even more than the hatchery fish.

Halstead: By the time the temperatures reached 80 degrees F, most of the fish had already passed the trap. It was late in the year when those temps occurred.

Orcutt: Program objectives. Has there been any work on developing total abundance estimates by USGS?

Halstead: There have been discussions. Marshall Flug may talk about this. One of questions has to do with the efficiency of the traps. One of the things we are waiting for is to see how well SALMOD is accepted by scientific community.

Spain: Have you tested to see if outmigrant figures have any value in predicting adult returns?

Halstead: We would love to do this, but have not had the time.

Spain: That would be a very good exercise. On page 10 you note the very low DO levels. These are terrible, have you done any work to determine why?

Halstead: That will be part of the flow study. On the return relationships, one of the things we have problems with is that big black hole in the ocean which masks some of these relationships.

Spain: If you stratify for bad ocean conditions (El Nino years) versus good ocean conditions (non El Nino years) you start to get at the magnitude of some of these factors. I urge you to do that.

Halstead: Thank you. We will.

Bulfinch: To Mike Rode, I saw the news article where they indicated they will be marking steelhead all CDFG releases. Is that taking place with this year's releases?

Rode: As far as I know.

Orcutt: They are being marked at the Trinity.

Bulfinch: So, in two years we should be able to distinguish point of origin.

Fletcher: To respond to some of the questions Glen had, the Hoopa Tribe has looked into a number of these issues this on the Trinity side. Maybe this group can get exposed to some of the work done on the Trinity side by these people.

Spain: It would be real helpful to do that. As I recall the Bodkin study came to the same conclusion; that the biggest factor was out migrant flows.

Wilkinson: In the perfect word, how would you expand your screw trap operations?

Halstead: Would be nice if we could trap below convergence of Trinity and Klamath.

Fletcher: We are trapping on the lower Klamath. There have been several meetings between all the pertinent Tribes and Agencies in the Basin to try to look at a coordinated approach to that type of monitoring. They have started to come up with some kind of recommendation.

Wilkinson: When you report to the KC, could you put together an expanded version of what you would like to do with the cost so we can begin to look at providing more of this information?

Halstead: Yes.

Spain: We can't do any data collection at all if we can't tell hatchery from wild fish. It disturbs me that we have big holes in our data like this.

Rode: CDFG committed to universal marking of coho and steelhead and we are continuing with fractional marking of chinook on both the Trinity and Klamath side so that should provide adequate marking to do the determinations that Bruce has to do with the screw traps. We haven't had problems with the chinook, it has been with the steelhead and the coho. The trend will be to get universal marking with the chinook; it appears to be what NMFS is asking for or will be eventually.

Halstead: There are automated ways to do this now. Amazing.

Farro: What percentage of the run do you estimate you are capturing?

Halstead: It varies all over, perhaps 1-20 percent. It doesn't seem to make any reason. That is why we haven't developed production model-don't have the confidence.

Farro: It looks like the trap is operating when the temperatures are up in the stressful range. What is the protocol?

Halstead: When temps were up, we saw stress; it was at the tail end of migration. We watch all the time. When dead fish show up in the trap, we are out of there.

### Added Agenda Item #2

Sullivan: Roger Patterson of the BOR said the regional directorate has submitted a letter to the Secretary of DOI with a draft bill attached with a basis for the re authorization and it is what the Trinity TF decided to sent forward. (Handout P)

Orcutt: Our Tribe's position is that there is authority under Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) to implement the Trinity program. We abstained from the vote on the TF package. We are not opposed to restoration but there are other vehicles.

Sullivan: I know there are other sources, but if you have the Trinity Restoration Program and it is funded strictly for the Trinity, it is much easier to manage if you know that it is there every year. If you have to go to the CVPIA restoration program or the state there will be too much competition. Reauthorization has been requested for eight years.

Barry: Is it true the 1999 budget through Reclamation is \$3 million rather than \$5.4 million?

Sullivan: Yes.

Fletcher: If the goal is to remain status quo, we know what that is. That is a listing, that is less populations of fish, that is less fishing opportunities for tribes and other individuals, etc. If the goal is to restore the Trinity, then we need to make that the goal and identify what it would take to get there. That takes a pretty substantial investment in terms of maintaining existing monitoring activities for harvest management purposes similar to the point Keith was making earlier. But it also means ensuring that agencies strive with each other to participate in the process. It also needs to include the cost of doing business at the hatcheries, it needs to include marking fish. If you are going to put fish into a system there has to be a responsibility to make sure those fish are marked and that managers can assess the impact or the success of those fishery releases. This group needs to seriously think about efforts to find some different funding sources that are commensurate with our need on the Klamath. That need is up in the millions; at least as great as on the Trinity side, if not more.

Farro: When you state that Trinity Program is trying to obtain this reauthorization to lock in the dollars so it does not have to compete with other areas geographically, that is an error in estimation. There is only so much public money that is going to be spent on restoration efforts. The restoration will have to be judged by the public on cost benefits. It will be hard to make the case that the Trinity will be isolated from that. We need to recognize this.

Rode: In the limited discussions I've had regarding the reauthorization, it was my belief that there would be a shortfall in terms of funding all the activities. Given this shortfall, will this be adequate funding to keep CDFG monitoring on the Trinity side? What is going to be dropped?

Orcutt: I would say yes.

Sullivan: The TF would decide that a certain amount would be strictly monitoring for the watersheds. There would be a separation so that we would not have long term projects and monitoring competing with each other.

Barry: Thank you.

### 13. Report on riparian vegetation fencing standards

Pace: I want to use this opportunity to comment on temperatures and fish kills. One thing that USFS has found is that there may be temperature changes in some of the tributaries as a result of damage from last year's storms. Elk Creek near Happy Camp would be an example. It's my understanding that you are putting together a summary of this.

Olson: Yes, there is some preliminary data from looking at temperature records from tributaries. This is being prepared but is not available yet.

Pace: Last summer I had a survey done on what kinds of standards are used on riparian restoration projects. We are recommending to the PAC to have minimum riparian fencing standards. A special committee would be an option.

Hillman: Thanks. An avenue for addressing this issue would be through our current review that is ongoing. We discussed the mid program reviews and the shortcomings of LRP and some areas where the LRP needs revision. In some cases there are substantial issues that were not addressed.

Pace: Without minimum standards, there are areas where riparian fencing is not a good government investment. On Scott River we are working with the ranchers. But if there is no minimum standard, projects are often just unequal.

Smith: The Scott and Shasta CRMPS are actively involved in riparian fencing. We have to make sure we do not come up with guidelines that put people out of business.

Pace: I agree. I am arguing that if there is a public investment, that there be minimum standard. The guidelines could be qualitative. I suggest that they be based on slope as part of the effort to set minimum standards.

Bulfinch: The problem is being addressed by Range Mac. Less distance is needed in flatland areas. One aspect that concerns me is that predisturbance vegetation depended on flood events in order to seed. No one has determined what will grow in what we have now. Distance alone is not the total answer. Looking at Willow Creek, trees have stopped growing. In Moffett Creek, the riparian has been converted. We need to know what will come back in.

Pace: The cooperators who do projects can give us an idea.

Halstead: We do spawning surveys, and we see two main impact on the redds. One is cows in the river. The other is fishermen trampling on the redds. Fencing will keep the cows out but will not keep the fishermen out. We need an information campaign. Any damage to redds will have an impact.

Smith: One of reasons that Shasta and Scott CRMPs have been so successful is that the efforts have been voluntary among the land owners. We will be more successful if they continue to be voluntary efforts.

Spain: Part of the package is to have off stream watering facilities. If you ask the land owner what he needs the stream for and figure out an alternative way to provide that, you are generally better off.

Smith: I agree.

#### 14. Report from the TWG on IFIM scoping

Belchik: I am here to give you an update on the IFIM scoping process. Last April, the TF gave us a directive to provide you with a flow study plan for various life stages of anadromous species from IGD to the mouth of the Klamath River in increments upon TF direction. We have met for at least three days/month to fulfill this direction. First, many thanks to TWG members for their efforts. Next, I'll give you an idea of the progress we have made.

Barry: We commend the TWG for those efforts.

Belchik: We have identified study priorities for each subbasin that we have identified. We have identified study topics and the questions behind those topics. One of our next steps is to consolidate what we have and get it into a form where we can bring in outside experts. They will tell us how to do it, how much it costs, and what the time line is to finish it. We went through a long scoping because we wanted not only to identify various types of studies that needed to be done in a flow study, but we wanted to have the rational also.

Regarding causative factors, we listed everything that we thought was holding back the recovery of the fish from the water management stand point and came up with questions. I did not provide you with all the study questions, but there are hundreds of study questions as a results of a brainstorming process. We need to consolidate them into concise questions. Then we asked ourselves what kind of discipline would answer that question. In many cases it was cross disciplinary. Many have a flow component and fish habitat component. We feel that this was a really good way to go because we were able to take a question that had multi disciplines and send it to multi disciplines. We did not lose questions that came up under both disciplines. Finally, we are embarking on a prioritization process. We identified what we thought the most important causative factors were in the major categories. Then each person picked out what they thought of as the most important. Those became our first priority statements (Handout Q). Next we took a cut at the second priority. We would like to consolidate our flow study questions, bring in our experts and finish up well before June meeting. We need to bring in Tom Payne or other river experts

that really know how to turn those ideas into study questions and then into RFPs. In the process, we also coordinated with the CRMPs and Sub basins. The Scott River CRMP has provided feed back on the matrix. The Shasta River CRMP has reviewed and provided feed back (Handout R).

Orcutt: Looking at the Mainstem Plan, three items do not include geomorphology component, yet it shows up under the last matrix. We have funded this work or someone has funded this. This seems like an inconsistency.

Belchik: Our matrix identifies things that we thought were causative factors. We put x-s where we were pretty sure we had data or could find data quickly that would say this a known problem. We put questions marks where we thought that was a causative factor but where data was not available. The geomorphological work we did put as an Ax@, however it did not shake out to be a main priority or main causative factor.

Orcutt: Yes, we agree. Yet the FWS went forward with that work.

Belchik: The work went forward before we were done with our prioritization.

Orcutt: The bottom part of the matrix, fish harvest, what is that?

Belchik: When we started with the causative factors, we started naming things that we thought were water management related and were a causative factor to the decline of the fish. For example, low flows in the Scott River blocked fish and made them more vulnerable to illegal harvest in the past. A lot of times there is a relationship between the ability and the opportunity to fish in the river and what the flows are. So that got named as a causative factor. When we first went through the matrix we didn't throw anything out. We thought that the prioritization was a better time to start saying that a factor may be insignificant so it gets bumped to a pretty low priority.

Barry: Did you explain on your matrix what levels mean?

Belchik: Level one means that we identified that or someone in the TWG identified that as the most important causative factors for that Subbasin. A level two means someone listed it as the most important within that roman numeral block, and level three meant it was not listed for either.

Russell: I sense some urgency. You want to have this done by the June meeting. Do you have a timetable?

Belchik: I was hoping to be done by this meeting. I put it to the TWG as a goal that we should be done by the June meeting.

Vaughan: What is the base of information you used to determine what the flow was before building of the dams. Is there good data available?

Belchik: To answer to your question 'is there good USGS gauge data available?' the answer is no. However, there are ways can estimate what summer base flows were at IGD and what percentage contribution there is further down stream. That is one question we will be able to answer more fully when the MODSIM model gets extended further down stream all the way to the mouth. KPOPSIM is going that direction too. But right now it is our opinion that flows have been altered a lot, especially in summer months.

Fletcher: Tell him about the Trihey and Balance Hydrologic reports. We have looked at that issue and we will give you a copy of these reports.

Belchik: Yes, the Yurok Tribe hired a well respected hydrologist to make an estimate on the pre project flows at IGD. And you can look at that report and use that; also DWR just came out with a report on the unimpaired flow of the Klamath River from Keno up and also at various points down stream.

Barry: Are there any comments from the public at this point about this exercise?

[None]

Barry: Mike, we need the TWG scoping report three weeks before the next TF meeting so that the staff can mail it out to us and we can absorb it

Belchik: By late May, I think we can do it. We may have to schedule an additional meeting to meet that dead line.

Barry: I would highly suggest that you get that information to Yreka at least two weeks in advance of the June meeting.

Russell: Mike did you mention a DWR flow study for Keno? Can we get a copy?

Belchik: DWR just came out with a report on unimpaired flow at Keno. Contact the DWR Red Bluff office.

#### 15. USGS presentation on continued involvement in the Klamath (Flug)

Flug: I am with the USGS Biological Resource Division (BRD). The offer has been made from our BRD Chief Biologist to supersede the Bureau Information Needs (BIN) process if the TF will commit to providing data needs that have been identified. We did have someone attend the TWG meeting last week to explain some of the specifics of the modeling effort. The reason that this meeting is so important in the time line is that next week my Center is having a regional coordinators meeting for all of these BIN needs. Then in two months, the final decision will be made. The reference correspondence is the one that I wrote to TF Chair and is attached to the agenda (Handout G). There is a memo to myself dated January 28 that was an update of where the USGS was with their work planning for FY 98 and indicated some things that we are unable to complete because the data has not been collected. There is a statement in that memo that says that we need a decision at this meeting.

#### 16. TF Discussion

Orcutt: What bureau contacted you initially, and why can't we continue with that process?

Flug: What we are working on now is all prior to the BIN process, prior to the BRD, probably prior to NBS.

Orcutt: Why don't one of the bureau-s pick up this process; BOR or FWS?

Flug: There are FWS projects. A lot of BIN statements have been very generic. One of problems is the bureaucracy. My center is located in the central region of the BRD of the USGS. Everyone is trying to redirect their money to be responsive to priorities within their regions. The Klamath Basin is in the western region, but the western region of the BRD has very little if any expertise in the area we are working on. But there is a commitment from our chief and supported by our regional director that if the TF wants us to continue they would supersede the BIN process. Once this decision is made where we are going to work, sometime in June, the team I work on will write new study plans. Our old study plan runs out in September 1998, and we will provide the new study plans to clients and internal review. There will be ample opportunity to review.

Halstead: How did BRD get here? It was when Bill Shake convened the first flow study effort in 1993. Initially, it was just to ask them to participate and to help guide us through the process. Then the big rivers initiative came along and Clair got involved. But mostly it has been on their own initiative. The Secretary did not direct it.

Fletcher: The letters are real clear. We need to act or the USGS is leaving the basin. Are you asking the TF to foot those bills?

Flug: Let me reiterate, those monies are not coming to USGS. We are willing to bring our base funds but we need to make sure that when we do that we are bring a team effort. We are committed to complete SIAM. In order to do that we need to have the field data collected. Unfortunately that has not happened for the last two years. The costs that are on here are estimated costs of what it would take to collect the field data. We need task study area A absolutely completed or we are not moving into FY99.

Fletcher: Obviously there are significant costs associated here and many of the members on the TF will have to shake some trees outside of this forum. You are asking for reaffirmation of the TF commitment to this process potentially through \$60k.

Flug: That is only for study area A. We are asking for one other area to be started in 1999.

Fletcher: I want to hear from the TWG also.

Belchik: It is true that a lot of the studies are in sync with TWG priorities. We talked about a lot of the study elements of SIAM and we did reach a consensus that SIAM is useful. We do endorse SIAM. However, there are some caveats. We think that SIAM is still in a research and development mode; it may not be applicable as a decision making tool. There are some hidden cost that are not represented on this. In particular, to make SALMOD work on the Klamath River you are going to have to account for the tributary input of fish that is not represented in the memo.

Smith: The TF gave a directive to TWG: A provide the TF with flow study plan for anadromous species at various life stages from IGD to the mouth of the Klamath River in increments upon TF direction. I believe that A and B would fit in with the directive and the rest does not.

Fletcher: Then I guess we will say see you later, Marshall. We are going to lose some expertise here.

Belchik: From the TWG technical viewpoint, if SALMOD is to be applied, it should be applied to all the tributaries. Realizing these limitations, the Shasta would be first priority. The Shasta had the most potential production and has lost the most.

Barry: Was the CRMP involved?

Belchik: No.

Orcutt: What we are speculating on is what other agencies budgets are. There may be opportunities with BOR. Is there any money within their budget? What about FWS?

Barry: I would have to ask Halstead, specifically regarding items 3 and 4 that were in the memo.

Halstead/Shaw: We have been working with USGS for the last three years. The Klamath is not an easy river to work on. Some of our work is funded by USGS for this FY. Item 4 has been funded every year by TF.

Barry: Is the annual young of year production estimates in your 1999 budget?

Halstead: No. The flow study on the Klamath is always the #1 priority and has been requested, but as far as we know there are no additional funds.

Barry: Is it in anyone's budget to complete item #3 in 1999?

Spain: BOR is trying to reprogram \$250k in FY98 funding. I don't think that it is specified as to what to do with it. This sort of study should be considered.

Smith: If we decided to go ahead and commit funding A&B, would it be a problem for you then to go ahead with your study; or if we only did A&C as Troy said, would that be a problem for you?

Flug: Our intent is a four year study and to do entire basin, but phased with TF priorities.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Fletcher) Adopt the recommendation of TWG that the TF support the cooperation and assistance of the USGS and that the TF fund in FY 99 the identified studies by USGS in study area A and that the TF begin studies identified in other study areas C, the Shasta River.**

**\*\*Motion Seconded\*\* (Hillman)**

Smith: I have to oppose that motion.

**\*\*Motion Amended\*\* (Fletcher) Adopt the recommendations of TWG: 1) That the TF support the cooperation and assistance of USGS, 2) that the TF fund the studies in FY 99 identified by USGS in study area A, and 3) that the TF work with the TWG to identify the other study area. The TF will commit to identify other sources of funding to share in the cost of these studies.**

**\*\*Second accepts\*\***

Rode: Your motion states that TF would fund both A and one other section. That bothers me, we do not have the money to fund the other section to the tune of \$400 or \$500k.

Orcutt: 1) How would that include study elements and continued involvement on the Trinity? 2) I have heard that the Klamath issues are a high priority with DOI. Why isn't this translated to funding commitments?

Barry: I would like to address that comment because I think it was addressed in the Federal Agency Budget priorities. On behalf of the FWS I had a very lengthy discussion with our Regional Director Mike Spear and again when our Director, Jamie Clark, was out here last week. In the past you have seen some commitment of outside money to help support particularly flow

study efforts (i.e., when Dale Hall committed some money to be put into the flow study here a few years ago). I heard someone say that work was done before the flow study scoping was completed. We have put money in and we have started working on it. That shouldn't take away from the fact that the flow study needs to get done, but we need to keep working on it. The fact that the flow study scoping is now coming to completion will provide further justification for funding the various elements of the flow study.

With that background information, Mr. Spear has given me the OK to say at this meeting that in the FY 2000 budget development he intends to forward from this region to the FWS headquarters an extra commitment to the Klamath Basin. He was not specific whether it was Trinity, Shasta, Scott, but he did want me to convey that it was a very high priority for him especially now that this flow study needs funding and needs commitment. It was been identified. The TWG has done a good job, the TF is doing a good job, and he is prepared to take on this challenge. He also wants it conveyed that tributaries are very important to include in the flow study. The FWS is committed to funding what needs to be done and keep USGS in the Basin.

Smith: So did you say FWS committed to helping the TF with the funding of these projects?

Barry: Yes, subject to appropriations of the funds, of course.

**\*\*Motion Amended\*\* That the TF adopt the recommendation of the TWG. That the TF support the cooperation and assistance of the USGS, and that the TF fund FY99 the studies identified by USGS study area A in the January 8, 1998 memo from Dr. Marshal Flug, and that the TF work with the TWG to identify the other study areas.**

**Spain: Would you accept as a Friendly Amendment that TF identify other sources of funds to share in the cost of these studies.**

**Fletcher: I accept.**

**\*\*Second Concur\*\* (Hillman)**

Russell: I did understand that in all this process, the TWG recommendations will be brought back to the TF?

Barry: That's right.

Bulfinch: I am uncomfortable with this because it doesn't comply with the original motion made to conduct the study from IGD down to the mouth. I would go along with the motion if it included giving priority to A and B so that we would have a quantity and quality flow model at least.

Barry: I want to remind everyone about the \$250k from BOR and I am certain that our Regional Director is going to be speaking with Roger Patterson about BOR's continued involvement in the future. So as far as the ability to provide the funds for these various other activities, I see the future as quite bright. Therefore, the statement that you made, Kent, about shifting our funding of the TF may or may not happen depending upon outside funding sources for these activities.

Bulfinch: If we don't identify the other one to get started on it may not be satisfactory to BRD.

Flug: As long as we know that there is a commitment to start on one of the other reaches that would be acceptable. It needs to be clear, however, that when you pick a study reach you are committing to support all the elements in that study reach.

Spain: I urge you to commit to this, Bulfinch. It is consistent with past motions to do a study from IGD to the estuary. Second, it is probably premature to predispose which study area has the highest priority until we have the TWG finishing its scoping of the flow study so that we can prioritize based on the best input. This is going to happen in June. So this is only a minor delay in identifying which ones will be the highest priority.

Farro: There seems to be an assumption that there are some areas that are not listed, (i.e., the Salmon River). Is there any value in just doing study area B without doing C and D?

Flug: Not in my opinion.

Smith: I want to make sure that with our limited funding that we accomplish what we set out to do and what we agreed to do in the study. Let's accomplish the mainstem part, then we will talk about the rest.

Fletcher: Flug has made it real clear we have to take a basin wide inclusive approach. We are quibbling over small amounts of money. The dollars are going to start to filter down. Once we get our act together. If we cannot accept the good work of our own TWG, then someone else will move forward.

Hillman: I concur with Fletcher. We have been talking about this for the last two years, but actually it has been the last 10 years that we have been kicking this subject about the table. The TF has recognized the need for this work from the onset of the program. We have spent a lot of time playing around building fences, putting rocks here and there. About two years ago pieces started coming together and the TF was asked by the DOI Secretary at that time to make a commitment to this effort. The Secretary explicitly asked to see a commitment from the TF to move forward. We made that commitment and we are here today on the verge of taking the next step. I concur with Smith that commitment is most important to do all the study elements. We do have to be conscious of budgets, but commitment is most important.

Belchik: Mitch asked if it useful to do one basin and not the other? We feel it needs to be treated as a system. The mainstem is important as Bulfinch stated, but tributaries are important also. When the TWG prioritized with regard to SIAM, we did so in the context of a limited package in response to USGS. We said its a system. You need to treat them all. Given budget limitations, we came up with the Shasta.

#### 17. Public Comment

Ross Taylor (TWG representative from Humboldt County): I would like to point out that on the summary of scoping we created, we identified five priority problems in the Shasta River. This is far more than any other subbasin.

Smith: Our representative was not at that TWG meeting. The vote did not come with the full support of the TWG.

Fletcher: She should have been there. Where was your representative?

Smith: I will look into that.

#### 18. Decision on USGS continued involvement

**\*\*Restatement of motion:\*\* That the TF adopt the recommendation of the TWG. That the TF support the cooperation and assistance of the USGS, and that the TF fund in FY99 the studies identified by USGS in study area A in the January 8, 1998, memo from Dr. Marshal Flug, that the TF work with the TWG to identify the other study area; and that the TF commit to identifying other sources of funds to share in the cost of these studies.**

Barry: So by the last phrase of the motion, I take it that what you mean is that the TF will seek funding sources but not particularly identify at this time where that money would go; just put a place holder dollar amount. If one particular entity would have a couple hundred thousand dollars to commit to this effort, it would be up to the TF discretion once we see how much funding is available to pick the area, then to direct the USGS. Is that correct?

Spain: Yes

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

#### 19. 1998 Workplan Follow up (Hamilton)

Hamilton: There are two decisions that have to be made on FY 98 money. First, \$10k was held back from the HSU Agreement pending a decision on the Flow Study Forum and second, \$8.4K of FY 98 dollars remains unallocated. In addition, the TWG has requested help with note taking.

Belchik: With regard to the HSU GIS, we recommend that they be given the full \$50k that the \$10k be added onto their contract. Secondly, the TWG has been using the research assistant in the past to take notes at our meetings. At the January TWG meeting we voted to stop using the person to take our notes and to free up their time to do GIS work which was originally what was intended. We really need a note taker. We need the same person time after time because we build on previous products and it just wouldn't work to rotate or get a temporary worker. We don't have a need for verbatim notes like you take at TF meetings. We made an estimate of the work load that would be required and I got an estimate to finish out the fiscal year from John's office. There are two estimates: 1) for \$ 6,400 to have their staff do it; 2) \$4,800 for a temporary person to do it. What we really need is for one of KRFWO staff to do it. I wrote up in a letter our need for a note taker for at least through the end of this FY.(Handout S). We recommend that part of that \$8k which is left over be dedicated for a note taker for the TWG.

Barry: The \$10k that was not included in \$50k for the GIS, it still remains unobligated at this point? The \$8,400 that has not been allocated; that's a separate pot of money?

Hamilton: Yes.

Barry: What products do we see from that GIS person? In other words, what have we bought for that \$50k a year?

Rohde: Some of products are the maps that go into the RFP. We didn't have a map with the RFP until we got the GIS Analyst. Their recent decision reflects the emphasis placed on him to be a GIS Analyst, not a secretary. The little work he has been able to do is work with CRMP coordinators and make sure there is a link between KRIS and TWG. We are behind the curve in terms of what we can generate. We will catch up on the curve by assembling comprehensive data sources. GIS will also be linked to the flow study effort.

Smith: It appears that we have been paying for some very expensive secretarial work. Mike, do you think that you could have a member of your committee take notes?

Belchik: We certainly talked about that as a first option. If you take a look at the scoping products, we are talking about 60 or 70 pages of detailed notes. Whoever gets tagged to take the notes at that meeting, their participation is greatly reduced, plus the consistency of notes varies from member to member. What we really need is a dedicated person.

Barry: What would you estimate the total cost would be for the whole year?

Belchik: It would just be a prorated on that. That was seven months work, so it would be  $\$6,400 \times 12/7$ .

Iverson: There has been a failure of communication between staff and the TWG. It is very appropriate to get HSU to do this. We cannot provide that kind of service for \$6,400. If TWG expects to get finished set of notes, it takes a professional to deal with these highly technical discussions. I do not want our office to be in position of saying that we can provide this service for \$6,400. We should not be minimizing this task. You folks never see the transcripts from the TF meetings. They are unintelligible. John Hamilton has to spend weeks deciphering and editing them. My recommendation is to continue with HSU. Or earmark an appropriate (\$30-40k) amount of dollars to do this. We have to be realistic about this, it is a very large, highly technical task.

Farro: We are hearing from our TWG that we are utilizing our GIS analyst for clerical. If we are not going to deal with that, we are remiss of our duties and respect for the information we are getting from our technical team.

Orcutt: The recommendation was to increase the budget by \$10k and not have the responsibility.

Belchik: Not to increase but to restore it to what it had originally had been budgeted for. The \$6,400 I got as a quote from KRFWO. We are not asking for someone to take verbatim written transcripts from our meeting and then reduce those down to a technical level. The research assistants have done a lot more in the past than just secretarial work so I do not want it characterized that we paid for some really expensive secretaries in the past.

Hillman: Considering Mike's comments, I would like to ask John where this \$6,400 estimate came from. With the \$6,400, what was your expectation?

Hamilton: The estimate was for purely clerical work, either a contract person or someone from our staff. If it is technical, we will need a biologist; and that would be considerably more as Ron said.

Barry: If the whole \$50k was provided, would that cover note taking for rest of year; and would there might be a little extra money for GIS products?

Fletcher: I will offer up my secretary or I will find someone within my staff for the up coming scoping effort. I will report back in June how that went and the costs associated with it.

Belchik: To answer your original question, you would be able to do one or the other. If you did the note taking, some of the GIS backlog would not get done.

Barry: Is someone going to frame this in the form of a motion? Remember we still have \$8,400 unallocated.

Spain: Fletcher has offered some staff support. Let's take him up on the offer. If it doesn't work, then we will fund secretarial staff appropriately. There is no need for a motion.

Fletcher: The only tasks that I am hearing is transcribing flip charts. Is there no way that KRFWO can do this?

Barry: That is correct.

Fletcher: You guys are just pushed to the brink as it is, and beyond?

Russell: If we cannot come up with the money, I guess we can ask the TWG to cut back.

Hillman: It is ridiculous that you cannot cover this basic clerical task to support the mission of this TF from the KRFWO \$340k. Year after year we cannot cover basic clerical support for what is obviously vital function of our mission.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Hillman) That we include administering the Klamath Restoration Project in the form of an RFP and put it out to bid.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Fletcher)**

Barry: The money is appropriated to the FWS and the FWS is charged with the administration of that money. We cannot contract out administration of that money. Congress has not given us the authority to pass it through to another entity.

Fletcher: There is one exception: the Indian Self Determination Act.

Barry: That would have to go through a process and get approval by the DOI Secretary.

Fletcher: We will assume the responsibility to do the note taking. I have taken it up on the Yurok tribe to do it for several months. I only have two secretaries, Ron, and I have 45 employees in my office. So I know the type of work your staff does, but in times of shortages and in times of priorities, you just put your heads to the grindstone, put your mind to it and get the job done.

Barry: Regarding the \$80k coming to the Regional Office, I can see if there is someone in the Regional Office that could come down to work.

Hillman: Thank you. That \$80k has been coming out of this program for at least 10 years and we do not get a hell of a lot for the \$80k. I would love to have an \$80k note taker if that's what it took.

Barry: Has the TF ever gotten a response in writing to the request to waive the \$80k overhead?  
I think it deserves to be asked for in writing because then you'll get a response in writing to tell you what the money is used for.  
Mike, what do you think about an outsider coming in with no knowledge of the program from the Regional Office?

Belchik: It seems to me the simplest solution would be restore some of the \$15k to Yreka Office and have them fill our needs. It is the most appropriate, they are the most familiar with the job, and the cheapest travel costs are to the Ashland and Yreka area.

Barry: I would like to know from Ron, if given a check for \$10k, how would you supply this man his needs?

Iverson: I would contract out with Personnel Services. To me the argument is over what the task is. I have seen the notes and it looks like a big job. To be realistic, set aside \$20-30k for FY 99. We could do the job.

**\*\*Motion Withdrawn\*\* (Hillman)**

Olson: How much do we want to pay the TF for technical support for GIS support? From my standpoint we have to look at the budgets. One of the questions that I have is since you really have not been getting full GIS support right now because of multiple duties, if you actually broke it into two tasks, one that was support of your meetings, you still have \$35k for GIS. Do we know what that would buy, would that be sufficient? How much do you know or need at this point?

Belchik: Right now there is a large backlog of projects that Van is working on. There is enough work to keep him busy for a long time and more comes in from the CRMPs. In terms of time and budget our need for a GIS analyst right now is \$50k a year for an entire year for GIS work.

Olson: You mentioned a full year. Is that 4 days/wk vs 5?

Belchik: Full time.

Olson: I am trying to get to the real cost. If you used \$50k a year, would that clear up the backlog or would it be like 50 percent of it?

Belchik: Our GIS needs will be increasing as opposed to decreasing.

Barry: Can your GIS needs be fulfilled through agencies?

Belchik: I could come back next time with a detailed report, what exactly it is we are getting.

Vaughan: I sure would like to see it broken down.

Barry: Let's keep the \$50k in there as a place holder, then have Bob come back at the June meeting and break out what the GIS actual support costs are. There are quite a few agencies that are represented on this TF that could provide GIS services as well. We have never asked. At this point we do not know what your needs are.

Belchik: We could look at that. I know that there has been a substantial investment that has been made into this GIS system.

Olson: There is a need, I do not doubt that, but there are some tasks that could be picked up by agencies at this table. This could be way to help you guys out.

Rode: GIS needs have grown over time and we might be at point where we are beyond what can be obtained through a grad student. It would be helpful to look at a copy of the agreement (Handout T).

Belchik: I am not sure it is broken out by line item as much as it is for note taking. It says light note taking. That was one of the big complaints by Kelly Duncan. She said that she was primarily used as a secretary and she did not get to put her GIS skills to use. We have been meeting more with flow study scoping and ongoing needs. The GIS analyst should be doing GIS work. That is why we want a note taker.

Orcutt: It was a priority, but has been diverted. How important was it ever anyway for GIS?  
What is original reasoning?

Belchik: We will be doing a lot of complicated, spatial analysis; the need will be increasing for GIS.

Orcutt: You have an agreement. You need to pull it apart and say what is for GIS and what is for note taking.

Russell: In the agreement itself (Handout T), one of the problems is that the duties are ambiguous. The agreement should be a little more specific on the duties for that amount of money.

Fletcher: It is pretty clear that person is supposed to be doing notes. We need to relook at this but, I do not want to push the issue at this TF meeting.

Rohde: I am the TWG liaison. We have put together a phased approach of how he will perform duties. I am willing to come to the next TF meeting with a formal presentation on the tasks and the phased approach to meeting these tasks as has been specified in his agreement. HSU provides a progress report to the FWS and has for the last several years. I will assemble and provide the information to you .

Rode: As I look at the last sheet in the packet, I'm really struck by the total overhead. The one glaring item was that the general administrative expenses went from \$800 last year to \$5217. I see that as a real problem almost a gross abuse. Overhead comes to 30 percent when added all up. This is too high.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Fletcher) Table the motion on the \$10k for the GIS analyst until June; at that time Bob and the TWG will bring it back to us.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Spain)**

### Discussion

Barry: The 1999 budget has a \$50k place holder for the GIS person, but I suggested the agencies could also provide GIS for the TF and TWG if we knew what you need. Bob, you volunteered at the next TF to provide a report of what the GIS products are

that you need to do. Through the Klamath Office, please provide the list of GIS work to us 2-3 weeks in advance so that other agencies can review it before the meeting.

Rohde: I will try to assemble and provide that in advance.

Barry: I want to look at that list and see what our own internal capabilities are for GIS.

Orcutt: How does the TF provide direction to TWG on GIS?

Rohde: Since October 1, the GIS person was doing the same tasks as the previous one. That task has been well used. What we are trying to do is modify these tasks. I don't see any immediate need to modify the contract, I just see the need to articulate what his tasks are, schedule the interface with the TWG, and list his other duties.

Barry: That will be part of your report next time.

Spain: Bob, regarding General Administrative expenses and overhead line items: is that a flat rate or are we actually getting something?

Rohde: I can get information on that.

Rode: Item E, can you provide that?

Rohde: Yes.

#### TF Decision

##### **\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

[NOTE: no decision was made on where to allocate the \$8.4k]

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Smith) That a formal letter go to the Regional Office and ask for relief regarding overhead. Ask them to waive the \$80k overhead; if they can't, find out to what extent can they help. The letter would also ask what services are provided for \$80k.**

##### **\*\*Second\*\* (Rode)**

##### **\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

#### 20. 1999 Budget Committee recommendations and RFP

Bulfinch: The Budget Committee met on December 10. We reviewed the TWG recommendations and did not make many comments. Our recommendation is provided in Handout K. We have since learned that the KRFWO has reserved funding for some of their activities to the tune of \$15k, so that reduces their amount to \$341,300. We would add \$6k of the \$15k to Category 1, \$4,500 each to Category 3 and Category 3.

#### 21. TF Discussion

Barry: Did I understand that the Budget Committee recommended \$45k for GIS analyst in FY 99 and that was reflected in item #3 in the memo that says that \$5k is an overhead charged by Humboldt State?

Bulfinch: Correct. And HSU rejected this. So it should now reflect the full \$50k.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Fletcher) That the TF set aside \$60k out of Category 3 to be devoted for the projects identified by USGS in their January 8, 1998 memo for study area A .**

##### **\*\*Second\*\* (Vaughan)**

Barry: We have not identified who is going to do that work yet. We assume that #4 is going to be the same proposal as last year. But we haven't gotten a proposal for #3 yet. We would be setting aside \$60k to do those two projects.

Vaughn: Where will this show up? Will it show as a line item that will show \$60k as a set aside or where does that go?

Barry: What I guess this will take the form of is a directed RFP for those two activities under category 3.

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

Belchik: Just want to remind you that to make SALMOD work, you need to account for the tributary immigrations of fish (Item A). You will have to make a wild guess or an estimate. The best way would be trapping of tributaries. That cost is not reflected on the matrix BRD presented on the cost of running SIAM/SALMOD.

Fletcher: We will work in different forums with different people to get those needs met.

Orcutt: I want clarification on the \$60k, on item 4; does this mean the FWS gets \$60k right off the top?

Barry: No, we are requesting a proposal to come in and that we will commit to fund \$30k for Item #3. On #4, I am assuming that we get the same proposal again that has been funded in the past for that \$30k, that was for FWS. It's not optional, we will fund the project, but we are just not sure who will get the money.

Barry: Lets move on to LIAM.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Vaughan) To budget \$9600 for LIAM.**

22. Public Comment

Pierce: No one liked LIAM the first time. An easier way would be to bring the past LIAM into the meeting and try to fix it (which I am sure you never will). In trying to fix it you will have achieved the goal. And you will have save \$10k.

Belchik: We had a letter from Tom Payne. He recommended strongly that you do an exercise of this nature before you wrap up your flow studies. Ideally you would do it before you start. The ultimate nature of the dispute resolution has a lot to do with the types of studies that they design. In TWG's opinion it is very important to undergo an exercise like this.

Orcutt: Agree. If parties hold back we will not get any where.

Russell: I agree with Pierce, can't we go into the room and beat it out and save \$10k?

Rode: It is more than a facilitator process. When you look at the overall scope of where we spend money, \$10k is not that much. If this can get us back on track, focus our energies, if it can prevent us from having repetitive arguments and discussion over issues that have been haunting us for a long time, I think it would be well worthwhile. As an example, Nat Bingham was disgusted in the written report that was published and was extremely emotional about how poorly this LIAM process started out. He has since come around completely and highly recommended that we complete this process. Perhaps the LIAM can serve in capacity of self evaluation and go beyond the scoping and help us as TF

**\*\*Motion amended\*\* (Vaughan) TF supports the LIAM concept and sets aside an amount of FY 99 funds not to exceed \$9, 600.**

**\*\*Second Accepts\*\* (Farro)**

Fletcher: Maybe Kier should do it. Not that I have anything against Lamb.

Farro: I am willing to earmark dollars in the budget, but want to see an example of one of these exercises and decision points prior to commitment or selection of a contractor.

Barry: So we are putting a place holder in for right now; and if we decide after our survey we do not find any suitable contractors, then the money will go to fund other projects that have not been funded.

**\* Motion Restated\*\* The TF supports the LIAM concept and sets aside an amount of FY99 funds not to exceed \$9,600. That the staff take time to look at who the possible contractors would be, with the intent to save money. That an example of LIAM be provided to the TF.**

Wilkinson: We may have forgotten what Lamb originally offered. If you are going to do a process like this, you have to make the commitment. It is critical that the TF commit to a date when we could all do it for two days.

Barry: If we vote in the affirmative, that means that we are committed to participating.

Orcutt: It is imperative that there is participation of all parties.

Wilkinson: Full participation is necessary. We want to characterize this as a workshop rather than a public meeting. We have been through this process before years ago.

23. TF Decision on FY1999 Restoration Program

Barry: Call the question.

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Rode) That we accept the FY 99 budget from the Budget Committee as amended by the Chair (Table 1).**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Wilkinson)**

Farro: I can't help but note that 21 percent of our budget is going to on the ground projects. We have institutionalized so much of the Instream Flow Incremental Methodology (IFIM) that its the main function of the TF. I won't be here tomorrow. I will say my piece. I can't support the request for additional funding for the TF until we can find a way to make the dollars hit the ground and until we go through the mid-program review and find a way to spend the money more effectively.

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\* (Farro abstains)**

Table 1. BC Recommendations for FY 99 as modified by the TF:

<u>Project Category</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Possible Dollar Amount</u>
KRFWO		\$341,300
GIS Analyst		\$50,000
Regional Office overhead		\$80,000
LIAM		\$9,610
Set Aside Sub Total		\$480,910
Category 1	40%	\$207,636
Category 2	30%	\$155,727
Category 3	30%	\$155,727 (\$60k set aside + \$95,727)
Grand Total		\$1,000,000

24. Upper Basin Amendment (Wilkinson)

Wilkinson: The Upper Basin Amendment (UBA) is where we left it at the June meeting. Some concerns were going to be addressed in the interim and they have been. Don brought a revision, generated by the water users. In fairness, no one else has been able to review it. My review will be from a personal stand point as Chairman of the Upper Basin Committee. The Committee has not had a chance to meet. The introduction of this new proposal appears to start the process over again. I would suggest, given all of the energy and all of the work that has gone into this, that we make certain that it is not lost. We should consider some alternatives as to what we might do with this. I am open to comments from the TF as to what strategies might be best. If put to a vote right now, the UBA would be defeated as it was in the past.

25. TF Discussion

Fletcher: If we did put it to a vote, we are talking about a document that was sent forward from the sub-committee, not the one with the new revisions that Don brought.

Wilkinson: If you recall, my motion in the June meeting was to freeze the UBA in time and space. That was the closest we ever got to agreement. There have been some significant technical changes, that is why I am concerned about starting the process again. I would like to put on the table a proposal that we not lose the product.

Russell: Elwood has not seen this document that I have brought in. There are changes in here. We will visit with Elwood. I am concerned with where we are. Given the many recent changes in the Klamath Basin as related to restoration, the UBA may not be up to date.

Rode: You can't capture everything in a document like this. Since we returned it back to Keith can we assume that Klamath County is happy with the product. Is it just a matter of Elwood concurring?

Russell: Good question. I need to give it to Commissioner Steve West. I would be remiss if I told you he would love it or Elwood would. I would guess our Commissioners will probably look to our acceptance of this document, but can't speak for Elwood.

Wilkinson: One of the options is to make this an administrative document and not throw baby out with bath water. We got as close as we could get; the TF could not act in a timely fashion and the wheels came off the wagon. We have not been able to get that close again. I am open for suggestions.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Fletcher) Move that we postpone this item ( UBA) till the next meeting.**

Barry: Which document do you propose postponing until the next meeting?

Wilkinson: The document prepared by the staff.

Barry: So now I have to go back to Mr. Russell. What stimulated your modification?

Russell: In 1995 the Klamath tribe severely modified the document and became again unacceptable. That is what prompted the new document.

**\*\*Motion Withdrawn\*\* (Fletcher)**

Russell: I have yet to have anyone tell me what this UBA will do for us that we are not already doing or going to do? I have never had that question answered. I'm not saying we should destroy the UBA. I was told that passing the UBA will help with funding in the upper basin, but a lot has changed since two years ago. We have funding for restoration now.

Fletcher: It will provide the linkage providing the TF with a document similar to the LRP. It gives me an idea of the current condition of habitat above IGD, some of the projects, and enables the TF to gauge its successes. Water quality from the upper basin is an issue. There is information in those documents that will help us through these areas.

Hillman: We can go back a long ways to track this animal. The UBA was one that we struggled with a long time. There has to be recognition of the fact that you cannot take a river basin and divide into bits and pieces. What goes on in the Upper Basin has a profound effect on our ability to achieve our goal under the Act. It is a connection that is undeniable. Formalizing the linkage was the vehicle used to justify Klamath County's seat on this TF. The reason why they are here is in recognition of the fact that cannot restore anadromous fish populations without partners from the Upper Basin. We were criticized that we had no Upper Basin representatives; now that we have them we do not want to acknowledge the obvious and the connection. I remind you that we cannot keep going on like this taking up the resources of this TF. I hope the hard work and efforts are not wasted. I appreciate your continued investment and energy. I commend the committee for putting that work into it. I hope that folks read the UBA again. That might help.

Wilkinson: Thanks for the comments, Leaf. It has become clear that in the short term there is not an answer. There certainly is a technical answer, but social concerns get in the way. This is why I am suggesting that we adopt it as an administrative document. Call it something other than the UBA. I would like for folks to consider it this evening.

Smith: I have a process question. I haven't seen Russell's document. Elwood is not here. He hasn't been here for the last three meetings. I hope he is well, but we all have an alternate. The Klamath Tribe should send one.

Barry: I will make a call to Elwood once we get the dates and times for the next meeting.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Smith) That we table this until the next meeting and get a copy out to the TF**

Fletcher: If the motion is to get a copy out of what Russell has, I would vote no. Wilkinson's group has put a lot of time and effort into the previous document. There was a definite cut off date. To have other alternated documents will just confuse matters. If anyone gets together, it needs to be Elwood and Russell. We all have been sent a copy of Wilkinson's document; if you do not have one, you should get a copy.

Wilkinson: We purposely put closure on comments on this document at the June meeting. Because there has been no motion to alter the document, the publication that we are addressing now should be the one that we received from staff at the last June meeting.

**\*\*Motion Withdrawn\*\* (Smith)**

Orcutt: Let's ponder this idea of the UBA as an administrative draft and look at what we can or cannot do and move on to what we can do. We need to emphasize that we should have something to show for all the work and start thinking about what we can do with this draft. If we can provide it as a reference draft, it will serve a purpose.

26. Public comment

[None]

27. TF decision and assignments related to Upper Basin amendment

**\*\*Move to Adjourn\*\* (Fletcher)**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Barry)**

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

February 20, 1998

Barry: On Table 1 of the budget recommendations for FY 99, it says that the budget committee recommends \$9,610 for LIAM should come out of Category 3, and I did not do that when I did my calculation. Should we change it or is it alright the way it is? I did not want to counter to the budget committee without discussion.

Bulfinch: It belonged in Category 3 anyway. We can accept the figures.

Wilkinson: We can put an additional note on the budget committee report to reflect the decision.

Barry: So noted.

Fletcher: Numbers six and seven on the budget committee report need to be revisited. Item number six speaks to items from the TWG but has some potential actions if the group wants to go through them. The letter dated December 9, 1997 from Belchik to Bingham had TWG recommendations to the budget committee. They identify that we do not have enough funds. There are also some other points that should be considered. It is important to recognize that there is not much money in the budget for monitoring. The TWG asks the TF to ask DOI for alternate sources of funding to pay for administrative overhead. TWG also asks the TF to ask BOR to fully fund monitoring of anadromous fish stock because of changes to these stocks due to water operations.

Bulfinch: It would logical that the BOR do so.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Fletcher) 1) That the TF ask the BOR to fully fund monitoring of anadromous fish made necessary due to the operations of the Klamath Project, 2) that the TWG will work with the BOR to identify appropriate monitoring, and 3) that the monitoring project needs are to be consistent with TF priorities.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Spain)**

Orcutt: I would like to hear Wirkus's response. I would like to hear further discussion. Monitoring is not graciously provided; to me, it is an obligation. Monitoring is a substantial amount of money.

Fletcher: My point is: 1) recognize that they have an obligation, I was not trying to define what that obligation is; 2) I want to provide some support for BOR because they need to take it forward. The intent of the motion is to help Wirkus go forward.

Spain: Adaptive management can't go forward without a monitoring program.

Wilkinson: I have concerns regarding timeliness. If BOR came through, will there be continuity of funding? We don't want to have a fiscal year gap.

Wirkus: What Wilkinson brought up is really important. Right now we are formulating the FY2000 budget and coordinating with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on consultation that has come out. The comparison with Trinity is important because they have very specific legislation/authorization or appropriations attached to it. That is where that stream of funding comes from. I have to negatively react to the assumption of obligation. It is a gracious positive contribution when BOR reprograms already obligated money. It was not projected in the previous budget estimate, so you have to move the money from somewhere else to do it. BOR is a willing participant and we need to realistically identify what needs to be done.

Spain: Regarding the \$250K of FY 98 funds potentially coming from BOR, I am not opposed to it going for the flow study. There are some options and maneuvering room in this year's and next year's budgets.

Wirkus: For FY 98 we have the process ongoing. In FY 99, it is an option; we need to identify the projects for FY 2000; the budget is in formulation. We are closer to 26 months behind.

Spain: This motion would provide support for the Appropriations Committee.

Smith: For a point of clarification, BOR funds should be consistent with TF priorities.

Wirkus: We need something we can support without a lot specifications.

Rode: Another important component is to come up with a comprehensive list of monitoring needs. We need to identify all our monitoring needs and attach costs, then compare the list with the Trinity side. As an aside, we need to endorse starting that process.

Wirkus: The monitoring is very important. We do need a broad program, we need to look at all support. Something important to come out of monitoring is that we are able to take the next step; that is to use the monitoring data to identify how it supports management actions; not just to have it as data but as identification of analysis.

Barry: Back to Mike Rode, what you are asking for sounds like a lot of work.

Orcutt: We have played a large role with this on the Trinity. Over the years have put together a list, so there is a template.

**\*\*MOTION RESTATED\*\*:** That the TF ask the BOR fully fund monitoring of anadromous fish made necessary due to the operations of the Klamath Project, 2) the TWG will work with the BOR to identify monitoring project needs consistent with priorities of the TF.

Spain: **\*\*Seconded\*\***

**\*\*Motion carries\*\* (Karl Wirkus was present to hear the motion)**

Spain: Where is the TWG on the issue of monitoring needs assessment?

Belchik: We have not begun a monitoring needs assessment, but it would probably go well with our IFIM scoping. It is important to first come to closure with scoping of the flow study.

Fletcher: We recommend that Sullivan keep us informed and involved on the Klamath side.

Belchik: We need to account for tributaries if SALMOD is to work, either with estimates or fish trapping. We prioritized based on causative factors that we felt were based on water management. Coming out of that will be studies based on priorities we have identified.

Spain: I am hearing that the TWG believes that this can be done in terms of 1) the monitoring assessment needs, 2); they couldn't possible do it before they complete the scoping, and the scoping is more important; 3) that pieces of the monitoring

needs assessment already exist and that there are people actively working on it; 4) that those pieces are not being coordinated particularly right now that people are doing it as the need arises. I would like to offer the following motion:

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Spain) That the TF request the TWG to coordinate and compile a monitoring needs assessment and provide its recommendations to the TF on monitoring programs necessary within the basin as soon after the TWG completes the (IFIM) scoping process as is practicable.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Bulfinch)**

Spain: Just like we have an orderly approach to scoping, we need to have an organized, orderly approach basin wide to monitoring needs. Then we worry about how much it costs or who pays.

Hillman: I would like to hear from Sullivan.

Sullivan: We have discussed this and Fletcher has suggested that I put an effort together. I need to get together with the group. That's my plan.

Fletcher: Since the TWG is absent a secretary, you can act as a clearing house. The expertise is in the TWG, Tech Team, and the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). They can funnel you information.

Sullivan: That is my intent.

Rode: Can we have a time line so we get an answer at the next meeting?

Sullivan: I can have report done by the next TF meeting.

**\*\*Amended Motion\*\* (Spain) To request that the TWG and the Trinity Watershed Coordinator (Sullivan) compile a monitoring needs assessment and provide their recommendations to the TF on monitoring programs necessary within the basin as soon after the completion of the IFIM scoping process as practicable. A time line is requested for the next meeting as to what might be involved and how long this might take.**

Barry: Is this doable, Mike Belchik?

Belchik: Yes. By June we could have a time line. The report, however, would have to come after scoping.

Rode: I suggest you break it down into two parts: 1) at the June meeting that we have a compilation of monitoring activities, and 2) later do the needs assessment.

Barry: So Bernice, do you understand that you are on the June agenda to compile a list of monitoring activities and work with the TWG on a timeline?.

Sullivan: Yes.

Wilkinson: I have some concerns and have had for years that there is not a strong or formal tie to the TWG and KC tech team. I would like to see that incorporated in this because there is some cross responsibility. Particularly from the standpoint of needs assessment because they clearly are different.

Sullivan: My intent is to coordinate with George Kautsky, not just the TWG.

Spain: Keith, can you request the KC provide input through Bernice?

Wilkinson: Yes, but it is still a concern that there is no formal tie.

Fletcher: Sullivan's position was created by the reauthorization of the Trinity Task Force (TTF) and requires coordination and exchange of information between the Klamath Fisheries Management Council (KFMC), TF, PAC, and TTF, so I would like to delegate responsibility to Sullivan to insure that some of those voids are met.

**\*\*Motion Amended\*\* The TWG is to coordinate with Bernice Sullivan's monitoring work group to compile a monitoring needs assessment, and provide recommendations to the TF on monitoring programs necessary in Klamath basin; this is to be done as soon as practicable after completing the IFIM scoping process and the TWG will provide a**

**time line at the next TF meeting. The needs assessment should be done in consultation with the KC, the TTF and all appropriate entities.**

**\*\*Second Accepts\*\***

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

#### 28. Development of a strategy to pursue additional funding (Pace)

Pace: Last year you will remember the initiative for one million dollars. It is based on the recognition that funding has been inadequate and needs are growing. The flow study has diverted funds away from on-the-ground projects. My organization is now looking at an additional \$1.25 million for restoration projects only, \$0.5 million for assessment work necessary to develop projects, \$.25 million for Subbasin plans and \$0.5 million for IFIM flow studies as directed by the TF. With the original \$1 million under the Klamath Act, the total is 3.5 million. We have engaged Tom Bohigian, Boxer's representative on Natural Resource issues in the state. Mr. Bohigian will come up and work with us.

Barry: I want the TF to have the discussion, but as DOI representative, I cannot take a position.

Pace: I want to inform the federal and non-federal members of the TF about the initiative. Because we have Riggs interested, Nat will work with him. March 17th is the date the House members will testify on Appropriations; the public testifies on the third. Nat will be working with Riggs to get this set of numbers in. Sign on is with the Senate members, they do not start until much later. In the next couple months we will first circulate that proposal to a broad range of non-governmental groups. We will listen to feed back, see if there are appropriate changes, and then put it back out for signature. Last year we had ~50 groups; hopefully we will have 150 this year. It would be good for Nat if he had TF approval on this because he is the person working with Riggs and he needs a sense from the non-federal members about how they feel on this. What would be good is if Glen could communicate with Nat in the next couple days about how constituencies feel about this effort. I do not think we can do anything formally in this short period of time.

Russell: I could support the quest for new funding, but I would prefer it to be for on-the-ground projects. Lets not put earmarks or names on these. The other thing I would want to see is the TF retains jurisdiction over the projects. Did I understand that there will be \$2.5 million for projects?

Pace: Of the \$2.5 million, \$1.25 would be for projects. Those projects are your priorities. These would be monies for activities pursuant to the Klamath Act. It would be your money.

Rode: Has this been coordinated with restoration groups on the coast; sport fishing groups?

Pace: It was last year.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Fletcher) That the TF support the Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA) efforts and others and move forward the supplemental appropriation request for the Klamath for an additional \$2.5 million.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Smith)**

Barry: We can attach to the meeting notes the letter he is developing to the hill.

**\*\*Motion Tabled\*\***

#### 29. TF Discussion

**\*\*Motion Restated and Reintroduced\*\* (Fletcher) That the TF acknowledge the efforts of KFA and others to move forward the supplemental appropriation request for the Klamath for an additional \$2.5 million.**

Spain: It puts a closure on the figure, which we need to do today and it does it in such a way that the TF is not officially endorsing it, therefore, it does not get into problems with federal agencies lobbying Congress. That I think is useful.

#### 30. Public Comment

[None]

31. TF decision on strategy to pursue additional funding

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\* (Barry abstains)**

32. Recap and summary of decisions/assignments (Hamilton)

Barry: Fletcher offered to help with clerical till the next meeting. We have done nothing else with the HSU GIS support, we haven't made any changes. Janet Doerr was looking for a letter from non federal members. So I want to continue this funding issue. She is on the same time line, March 17, and she needs a letter.

Fletcher: I volunteered to do the letter. So I will just include the costs identified by Pace. And in addition to those costs, I would identify the costs of the USGS gauging stations. I would work off the USGS letter to get that information, and send a copy to the FO.

Belchik: Think about costs for the SALMOD in the letter.

Barry: This will be set up for Bingham's signature, as vice chair. Are we in agreement that is the best way to go with Janet? Hearing no objection, we will proceed.

ADDED AGENDA ITEM #3

Barry: Does the TF want to officially respond in writing by March 6, the deadline for BOR to receive comment on the Klamath EA?

Fletcher: One of the footnotes in the EA made it clear that none of the alternatives adequately protect instream flow and the needs of the anadromous fish.

Pierce: There are conflicting statements in the EA. I will give credit that BOR recognized senior Indian water rights. But then BOR says all alternatives provide inadequate flows for fry, juvenile, and adult fish. The TF according to the restoration act is here to advise the Secretary of the DOI It would be entirely proper to advise the Sec that BOR is providing flows that are in conflict with the Klamath Restoration Act.

Spain: What is process for the TF formulating comments on document like this?

Barry: Each agency, each individual should comment on their own. How can we possibly come to consensus in such short period of time?

Russell: The TF is not the proper forum. In 1997, it was a wet year and we barely met the biological levels in the lake. In a normal year, agriculture is going to take a devastation hit. In all fairness, the Project is unfairly targeted to take the hit. So we will, on behalf of Klamath County and the water users, be submitting comments in writing to that effect.

Spain: I also agree that this forum is not the appropriate place. The TF needs to maintain a certain neutrality.

Fletcher: Our charge is to rebuild anadromous fish to an optimum level. We all have own constituents but as a group are charged with fish restoration.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Fletcher) That the TF advise the Secretary of DOI that the BOR is developing a 1998 Operations Klamath Project Plan which is not compatible with the Klamath Restoration Act.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Bulfinch)**

Russell: We are assuming that the Trihey study is the best that we will ever have and that we are prepared to tell the Secretary that we have evidence that those flows are essential to the species. I do not necessarily agree with that.

Fletcher: The Secretary is responsible for choosing an operational plan that meets instream flow needs, fish needs for tribal trusts, senior rights in the basin, agricultural, refuge needs, etc. This is not a comment on the science that goes into it. It just says we have a concern with the document.

Russell: We are talking about a subject here that is extremely volatile. There is reason to be cautious. Do we want to send conflicting reports to the Secretary of the DOI? As a member of this TF, but also as a member of Klamath County, I don't see how I can do that.

Barry: Is there recognition in the EA about the many efforts under way to increase water supplies?

Wirkus: Yes.

Smith: I have economic concerns as well. It is not appropriate for us to comment.

Spain: While it disturbs me deeply that none of the alternatives in the EA will fulfill the flow needs, as a commercial fisheries representative, I will vote no. This is because I want to preserve this forum to deal with the common interests.

Fletcher: I want the motion out there because there is merit to discussion where there is an impasse.

Russell: It would behoove the TF to learn how the Project operates. It disturbs me that we never have any movement toward storage. We invite the TF to a field trip; we have nothing to hide.

Spain: I would like to request an individual vote.

#### Public Comment

Belchik: I am here to comment as a member of the public. The TF is not being asked to render an opinion or judgement, just look at exactly what the EA says. And that is all this motion is asking you to point out to the Secretary of the DOI.

**VOTE: Yes: Fletcher, Orcutt, Rode; No: Spain, Russell, Smith, Wilkinson**

**\*\*Motion Fails\*\* ( Abstain: Barry, Bulfinch)**

#### 33. Set the date and location for the next two meetings. Identify additional agenda items for the next meeting.

Bulfinch: Given that we are working on TF awards to cooperators and landowners, I ask that the next meeting be held in Yreka.

Wilkinson: The Water Fest is in Klamath Falls, June 26th-27th.

Carpenter: As Co-chair of Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (UKBWG), I would like to say that Russell and Elwood and UKBWG were not even part of UBA when it started. That document has been dated in time. As part of legislation, we are in position to get matching funds and in that spirit started Water Fest. We invite you once again. If you meet on Thursday and Friday then can take in the Fest on the weekend. Agriculture may show restoration projects. We hope to have Washington, D.C. folks there; and there will be a formal dedication of Tulana Farm and Wood River projects.

**\*\*Motion\*\* (Wilkinson) That the TF hold the next meeting in Klamath Falls on June 25-26.**

**\*\*Second\*\* (Barry)**

**\*\*Motion Carries\*\***

Smith: I request that the meeting after next be held in Yreka.

Barry: Lets have it October 15-16, 1998.

Adjourn

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING**  
**February 18-20, 1998**  
**Brookings, OR**

**Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Members Present:**

Cynthia Barry	U. S. Department of the Interior
Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
Mitch Farro	Humboldt County
Troy Fletcher	Yurok Tribe
Leaf Hillman	Karuk Tribe
Al Olson	U.S. Forest Service
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Indian Tribe
Michael Rode	California Department of Fish and Game
Don Russell	Klamath County
Joan Smith	Siskiyou County
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen Association
Mike Vaughan	Del Norte County Board of Supervisors
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

**Attendees:**

Mike Belchik	Yurok Tribe
Ned Burgess	Salmon Harbor Resort
Jim Carpenter	Upper Klamath Basin Working Group
Earl Danosky	Talant Irrigation District
Carol Davis	Commercial Fisher
Jana Doerr	Congressman Peter De Fazio's Office
Marshall Flug	USGS-BRD-MESC
Mark Grenbemer	Oregon Governors Watershed Enhancement Board
Bob Hagbom	City of Brookings Watershed Council
Bruce Halstead	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata
John Hamilton	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Yreka
Kelly Helstrom	Northern California Indian Development Council
Ron Iverson	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Yreka
Steve Lewis	Ecosystem Restoration Office, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike McCain	U. S. Forest Service
Judy McDaniel	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Yreka
Felice Pace	Klamath Forest Alliance
Ronnie Pierce	
Juanita Quijada	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Yreka
Tom Shaw	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata
Frank Shrier	PACIFICORP
Bernice Sullivan	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Ross Taylor	Humboldt County-Technical Work Group
Andrea Tuttle	William Kier & Associates
Jim Waldvogel	Technical Work Group
Jim S. Welter	Port of Brookings Harbor
Karl Wirkus	U. S. Bureau of Reclamation

**FINAL AGENDA FOR THE KLAMATH TASK FORCE MEETING**  
 February 18-20, 1998  
 Brookings Inn  
 Brookings, Oregon

February 18, 1998

- 1:00 PM 1. Convene and opening remarks.
- 1:15 2. Business
- A. Adoption of agenda
  - B. Adoption of minutes from the October 15-16, 1997 meeting
  - C. Decision on new TF Chair
  - D. Decision on the report on non-federal funding sources (Rode, CDFG)
- 1:45 3. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence
- A. USGS gage funding (Barry)
  - B. Correspondence from USGS/BRD and TF Chair
  - C. Letter from Karuk Tribe on Water Supply Options initiative
- 2:00 4. Update on Klamath Basin ecosystem restoration issues before Congress (Staff from the offices of Senators Wyden, Smith, Boxer, and Feinstein, and Representative DeFazio)
- 2:20 5. Summary of Five Chairs meeting (Fletcher)
- 2:40 6. Mid-Program review update (Fletcher)
- 3:00 7. Report on Southwest Oregon Salmon Restoration Initiative (Mark Grenbemer, Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board)
- 3:30 8. Status report on 1998 annual operations plan and EIS on BOR Klamath Project (BOR, Wirkus)
- A. Explanation of two requested model runs
  - B. Relation to December '98 water advisory
  - C. \$250k from BOR for Klamath Restoration Program
- 4:00 9. Recommendations on strategic restoration and subbasin planning update (Rohde)
- 4:15 10. TF Discussion
- 4:30 11. Public Comment
- 4:45 12. TF Decision on strategic restoration and subbasin planning
- 5:00 Adjourn

February 19, 1998

- 8:30 13. Report on riparian vegetation fencing standards in the Klamath Basin (Pace)
- 9:00 14. Report from the TWG on IFIM scoping (Belchik)
- 9:45 15. USGS presentation on continued involvement in the Klamath (Flug)
- 10:15 16. TF Discussion
- 10:30 17. Public Comment

10:45 18. Decision on USGS continued involvement, data collection on the Klamath, and SIAM/SALMOD validation

11:00 19. 1998 Workplan follow up (Hamilton)  
A. Request for \$10k for flow study review/coordination  
B. Additional funds for TWG scoping (Belchik)  
C. Unallocated FY98 dollars

11:15 20. 1999 Budget Committee recommendations and RFP (Bulfinch)

11:30 21. TF discussion

11:45 22. Public Comment

12:00 LUNCH

1:00 23. TF Decision on FY1999 Restoration Program  
A. Funding for LIAM  
B. Categories  
C. RFP revisions  
D. USGS data needs

5:00 Adjourn

February 20

8:30 24. Upper Basin Amendment (Wilkinson)

10:30 25. TF Discussion

11:00 26. Public comment

12:00 PM LUNCH

1:00 27. TF decision and assignments related to Upper Basin Amendment

2:00 28. Development of a strategy to pursue additional funding (Pace)

3:30 29. TF discussion

3:45 30. Public Comment

4:00 31. TF decision on strategy to pursue additional funding

4:15 32. Recap and summary of decisions/assignments (Hamilton)

4:45 33. Set the date and location for the **next two meetings**. Identify additional agenda items for the next meeting.

5:00 Adjourn