

**SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED
CRMP COUNCIL**

(Coordinated Resource Management Planning)
May 1, 1999 to November 16, 1999

and


**SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED
COUNCIL**

November 16, 1999 – May 31, 2000

Final Report

Contract # FG 8145 WR
(Includes USFWS Final Report for first semester)

May 1, 1999 – May 31, 2000



DATE APPROVED 6/28/00 INITIAL JS
DATE FILED 7 INITIAL JS

Abstract
Final Report
Contract # FG 8145 WR
May 1, 1999 to May 31, 2000

This abstract covers the activities of the Scott River Watershed Council (Council) from January 1, 2000 to May 31, 2000. The abstract and report for the first eight months (May 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999) is included in the attached Final Report for US Fish and Wildlife Service which was a matching funder of the Council for the period of May 1, 1999 to May 31, 2000. That report includes background of the organization, staff description, and the happenings of the Council for the first eight months.

The Council has held monthly meetings from January to May 2000. All meetings included a business portion and an educational portion except for the April meeting which was purely for project prioritization and May meeting which was purely educational. The agendas and minutes of those meetings are included in this report. The Council Coordinator's reports presented at those meetings are also included.

All six subcommittees (Community Relations, Education, Fish, Land, Monitoring, and Water Committees), the Technical Committee, and the Executive Committee all met monthly also with a couple of exceptions. The notes on nearly all those meetings are also included in this report.

Two workshops have been held in the five month period from January to May. Dr. Richard Miller, Oregon State University directed a workshop and field trip for landowners on juniper management, and Dr. Ken Tate went with landowners on a field trip to the Moffett Creek watershed and, along with a spaghetti feed, sponsored by the Council, talked to an audience of over fifty people about landowner sediment and water temperature monitoring and its benefits leading up to the TMDL process.

Also included in this report are the two newsletters, newspaper articles and announcements, and current project list.

Since the upheaval in November 1999, the Council has settled somewhat into a rhythm. Participation has been good, but the members are still seeking a wider community involvement. A cross-section of interests is still at the table, although people are representing themselves rather than organizations, with the exception of agency representatives. Standing Committees are where the most action is taking place. That seems to dissipate the friction which was prevalent between 1992 and 1999 in the Council meetings. Also, the work of the Technical Committee has been crucial to the success of the CRMP/Council over the last year and a half. Having a group of professionals on which to depend for advice reduces some contention.

The process to develop a *Scott River Subbasin Strategic Action Plan (Plan)* has begun and has a scheduled finish date of January 31, 2002. The processes that have been at work to gather the information for the *Plan* are described in this report.

Council discussions are always lively. The tone has stayed positive and optimistic about the development of the *Plan*. The Coordinator works hard to keep channels of communication open.

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

Final Report Contract # FG 8145 WR

Standing Committees (Community Relations, Education, Fish, Land, Monitoring, and Water Committees) have been doing the work of the Council since January 1, 2000. They have dealt with project proposal development, educational events, and are presently working on gathering information for planning. Most of the committees, where a CRMP precedent exists, are using the CRMP plans for guidance until the *Plan* is written. The new committees have written their goals and objectives, which can be found in the various committee meeting notes.

Several **educational speakers** have been invited to regular meetings:

January 2000: Dr. Sari Sommarstrom spoke on her study of watershed groups their efficacy and gave recommendations to the Council based on her study.

February 2000: Dr. Ron Iverson spoke on the subbasin planning expectations of the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force.

March 2000: Richard Vanderwater, USFS, spoke on the capabilities of GIS.

Two **workshops/field trips** were held, one in March and one in May. Dr. Richard Miller, Oregon State University juniper specialist, did a slide presentation and went out on the ground with twenty (20) landowners and interested parties on March 8, 2000 to discuss the juniper intrusion into the dry, east hills of the Scott Valley. He dispelled many false beliefs and informed the public on many interesting aspects of juniper. See attached itinerary in Section IV.

The May 30th field trip and presentation by Dr. Ken Tate, UC Extension, Davis, Watershed Specialist, was about the TMDL process and landowner monitoring of sediment and water temperatures. The field trip was attended by six Moffett Creek landowners and the presentation was attended by over 50 people, mostly landowners. Dr. Tate's message was loud and clear: Landowners had best monitor their own sediment and water temperatures to see that they do not have a non-point source of pollution on their property.

Four **Subwatershed Landowner Groups** have been active. The Moffett Creek landowners have had a meeting and several attended two field trips in their area. The Sugar Creek water user group have met several times and developed a project proposal to pipe their water diversions in order to save water to instream flows. The Tailings Landowners have met several times to discuss a prospective restoration project which would provide flood plain in the area and, thus, dissipate hydrological energy in flood stage to reduce the bedload it contributes to the Scott River below. The Shackelford/Mill landowners have met once to seek alternatives to gravel push-up dams to divert water. In their efforts to comply with the 1603 permit requirements, they have had a difficult time finding methods acceptable to the CDFG.

The Council has decided on a process and time line to develop the ***Scott River Subbasin Strategic Action Plan***. The Council, committees, and community are to collect all and any pertinent information that could be used in such a plan from May to December 2000. At that point the hope is that the Council will have acquired funds to hire a technical writer/planner to go

through all the information and seek any other that may be available. Then he/she will write the *Plan* with help and coordination from the Council and Coordinator. The draft plan would be distributed in eight months' time to the public for review. The final draft will be done by January 2002.

The Council has had the help of Carlin Finke, a Humboldt State University graduate student in mapping limiting factors to a healthy anadromous fish population and a healthy watershed. The community has been invited into this process, but mostly agency biologists and Siskiyou RCD personnel have attended the first three meetings. The process will continue throughout the summer of 2000. The information will be very useful for the *Plan*. See the most current information in Section V.

The **Budget** did not differ much from what was proposed. It turned out a little short in transportation because many more committee meetings were held than had been in the past.

In-kind funds exceeded what was proposed because many more volunteer person-hours were spent due to the many committee meetings. In addition, the Coordinator has housed Carlin Finke on several occasions which were not proposed as matching.

In **conclusion**, the Council is off to a new start and humming along. The planning process and the education process are the most beneficial pieces of the Council. A libertarian and property rights advocate, well known in the Scott Valley, stood up in front of a crowd of people and praised the professionals on the Fish Committee and thanked them for all he had learned. He is the executive representative to the Council from that committee.

**SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED
CRMP COUNCIL**

(Coordinated Resource Management Planning)

May 1, 1999 to November 16, 1999

and

**SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED
COUNCIL**

November 16, 1999 – December 31, 1999

Final Report

Contract ID # 99-PC-01

Agreement # 113339J027

May 1, 1999 – December 31, 1999

By

Jennifer Davis Marx

Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator

Siskiyou Resource Conservation District

Prepared for the

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Klamath Fisheries Restoration Program

January 2000

Abstract for Final Report for # 99-PC-01

This seven-month period has been, to say the least, marked by transition. The Scott River Watershed CRMP (Coordinated Resource Management Planning) Council has become the Scott River Watershed Council (Council) as of November 16, 1999. That name change is a sign of much deeper changes in the process. That change is the result of a stalemate and lack of participation, which were described in the last final report for this organization.

The steps in the changes in the Council are the following:

1. In May and June 1999 two special, facilitated meetings were held to help the Council to get past the problems of stalemate and dropping participation.
2. In July the facilitator made recommendations, based on a survey which participants had filled out.
3. In September the Council nominated an Ad hoc Committee to address needed changes in the CRMP Council process taking into consideration the facilitator's recommendations.
4. The Ad hoc Committee returned in November with considerable suggested changes in the process including changing to a smaller number of voting members and using a super-majority vote rather than consensus for actions. One CRMP Council voting member did not vote to approve the new process as a work-in-progress. Another Council member made a motion to continue the CRMP as it had been operating. Two voting members did not approve that motion. The CRMP Council dissolved and ten minutes later the Scott River Watershed Council formed and voted to use the CRMP's Ad hoc Committee's recommendations as a beginning point for the new group.
5. The Council has had considerably better landowner participation since November. The group has been working under the new process and revising it simultaneously. The new energy is encouraging, but the prospect of starting over on all aspects of the process would be discouraging. I am confident that the members who have stayed with the process through the changes will help to retain the good parts of the CRMP Council.

The usual level of educational workshops, educational presentations, and committee work has not been maintained in the last six months because of the lack of participation early on and the recent need to focus on rebuilding the process.

Although planning efforts have been minimal within the Council, the Coordinator has been working regularly with the Technical Work Group and the Humboldt State University Natural Resource Department of Planning and Interpretation. A community mapping exercise led by Humboldt State graduate student Carlin Finke has involved a local group of agency and community people familiar with the Scott Watershed in identifying limiting factors for anadromous fish and locating them on maps.

The success of the Council in resolving resource problems in the Scott River Watershed rests first of all in the participation of the community. If they are not involved, the Council is defunct. The new Council is presently made up of new and old members. Committee sign-ups are good. If that energy can be maintained, I am confident that the Council can move forward in their restoration efforts of fish and other resources.

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED (CRMP) COUNCIL

Final Report

May 1, 1999 – December 31, 1999

The Scott River Watershed CRMP Council (CRMP) was originally made up of 18 members who represented landowners, agencies, and a cross-section of interest groups in the Scott River watershed. The CRMP used the consensus process to make decisions in order to solve some of the local natural resource problems by developing plans, by developing restoration projects guided by those plans, and by seeking funding for those projects which are then implemented by the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District (RCD). The process was open to the community at large although they had no voting power unless they became members according to the *Bylaws*, approved by the CRMP in August 1999.

The CRMP actually dissolved on November 16, 1999. That dissolution because of its very short term could be likened to a "control, alt, delete" move. The new Scott River Watershed Council (Council) began its process ten minutes later. The Siskiyou RCD has, by resolution decided to sponsor and administer the new Council and its operations as it did the previous CRMP. The new and still evolving process of the Council dominates the content of this report.

BACKGROUND

The first "official" CRMP meeting was held on September 3, 1992 with monthly meetings being held since then. This is the sixth *CRMP Final Report* to be submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service since the founding of the CRMP. Complete background information can be found in the four previous *Final Reports*. This report covers a time period of seven months, May 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999, the seventh funding cycle provided by the Klamath Fisheries Restoration Program. The Siskiyou RCD identifies the project as CRMP VII.

ORGANIZATION AND PROCESS

Membership

The CRMP Council was officially made up of eighteen (18) voting members of whom only six (6) were participating actively enough to retain voting rights in November.

The new Council is made up of members who do not represent specific organizations except in the case of agency folks, who are serving in an advisory capacity and representing their respective agencies. The group has discussed, but has not yet figured out how to show the multi-interest nature of the organization. It has been suggested that people proclaim their own interests (e.g. rancher, environmentalist, timber owner, etc). It has been my observation thus far that all interests are fairly well represented. Committees, which will be meeting for the first time at the end of January and the beginning of February, have been given direction to seek multi-interest representation if it does not already exist among the volunteers.

Meetings

The regular meetings of the full CRMP and the new Council have been held the third Tuesday of every month at 7 PM alternating between the United Methodist Church in Etna and the Fort Jones Community Center. The Executive Committee, presently an interim group of Council members, RCD staff and the Council coordinator, meets every month to set the agenda after input from the full Council.

Sometimes a publicized, educational portion of the meeting precedes the business. Meetings are always open to the public.

CRMP (Council) Staff

Three part-time people and one full-time person provide the staffing for the Council. The Council Project Manager oversees the Council's administrative and budget needs, takes notes for and writes up the minutes of meetings. The Council Project Manager is also the Siskiyou RCD District Manager. Carolyn Pimentel currently holds this position.

The Council Program Coordinator is responsible for "moving the vision" of the Council by means of a variety of tasks and strategies (See Section #1 for description of job tasks). Jennifer (Jeffy) Davis Marx is the current Coordinator and has held the position since February 1996.

Gary Black has been a Council Project Coordinator since May 1995. His task is to coordinate Council project implementation through the RCD. Gary's direct involvement in Council for the purpose of planning and project development is funded by the Klamath Fisheries Restoration Program and the California Department of Fish and Game; the various projects sponsored by the Council and RCD fund most of his position.

Lorrie Bundy has been a project coordinator since April 1997. Since Lorrie has a degree in Environmental Engineering and Math Analysis, she takes responsibility for many of the technical aspects of the planning process and projects such as monitoring and fish screen design. She has been instrumental in organizing and administering the CRMP Monitoring Committee and has been very actively involved in the Water Committee. Lorrie also wrote the proposal for a three-year monitoring program recently funded by the California Department of Fish and Game.

The newest RCD project coordinator, Warren Farnam has focused his efforts mostly on upland sediment reduction projects and on a Council/RCD project funded by the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force which is promoting water conservation through improving irrigation practices. Warren attends Council and Upland Committee meetings.

The Council funding also has helped fund an AmeriCorps volunteer, Danielle Quigley, who, on a part time basis, is helping with the implementation of the Etna High School Resource Educational project, coordinated by Abner Weed, and coordinating the resource education with the Siskiyou RCD. She has spent many hours running things and people down around Etna High School to keep the program running smoothly. She will be helping to guide an Etna High student in finishing the Etna High School's resource webpage. Danielle has skills in water chemistry and GPS usage, which are helping with both the training of the students and the implementation of Council/RCD projects.

Funding Sources

The Klamath Fisheries Restoration Program has been the principal funding source for the CRMP in 1999. The California Department of Conservation funded the organization of subwatershed landowner groups through the end of 1999 as well as some equipment to be used for the educational purposes. The California Department of Fish and Game has committed \$20,000 to Council for the 1999-2000 fiscal year. That funding is what the Council will be operating with from January 1, 2000 until June 1, 2000.

Committees

Some of the CRMP subcommittees continued to work together through the transition period from June 1999 to November 1999, but many were not active for lack of participating members. An Ad hoc Committee arose to address the special needs.

The Upland Committee met once in the summer and once for a field trip this fall to look at some land up McConaughy Gulch, where there is opportunity for vegetation conversion. Historically there were spring tanks which were full most of the year.

The Water Committee has continued to meet to develop a work plan for 2000. Let's hope that all the work they have done to revise the Fall Flows Action Plan is recognized by the new Council.

The initiation of the Technical Committee was the single most important action taken by the CRMP Council in 1999. That committee has met for some reviewing and revising of the project rating process and they rated few projects in August 1999. They will be an integral part of the Watershed Council.

An Ad hoc Committee, which volunteered to address needed changes in the Council structure, is to be applauded for their dedication and vision. They met intensively through September, October, and November to come up with a process which would work for all, and they, as individuals, are still working with the Council to adapt it to the needs of all.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH

Educational/informational News Articles: The Coordinator writes monthly articles for the local *Pioneer Press*, which inform the public of the activities and some of the issues of the Council. In addition, articles announcing educational events and describing projects and programs of the Council and RCD are published fairly often, probably not often enough in the recent months, again, because of the transition period.

Stream Care Guide: The CRMP approved the printing of a stream care guide on the grounds that additional funding could be found to do so. The Siskiyou County Fish and Game Commission and the NRCS are in the process of considering paying \$500 each to be matched by a \$500 contribution by the Council.

Fair Booth: A Siskiyou County fair booth was set up in August 1999 for the Fair. The booth, because of the fair theme, emphasized the history of conservation in the Scott River watershed and specifically that which had been accomplished by the Siskiyou RCD (also turned 50 years old in 1999) and the Scott River Watershed CRMP. The booth won second prize in its category.

Invited Speakers at regular meetings:

The CRMP had far fewer than the usual number of educational speakers because many times when the Coordinator brought up the prospect, the Executive Committee opted to deal with the immediate internal problems instead.

- ♦ Freda Walker: Freda, who has served as meeting facilitator on a regular basis in the past, came to several meetings to help the group to get past gridlock. Freda met with the CRMP on June 2, 1999 in a special meeting to discuss the results of a survey which she had sent out to members and participants. In August, Freda submitted a list of recommendations for the CRMP's direction, based on the previous discussions and survey (See Section III).
- ♦ Jim Depree, Siskiyou County Resource Specialist, spoke to the CRMP at the August meeting about the County's projected groundwater management plan. Afterward the CRMP approved a letter directed to the County to encourage an "acceleration of the process" (See Section IV).
- ♦ A video entitled *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems* was shown at the October meeting because of interest in the CRMP sponsoring an often-discussed Water Users group. Although consensus on this matter was never reached, it is still on the table. The new Water Committee will be addressing it, I am sure.
- ♦ Although Sari Sommarstrom was going to speak on her study of watershed groups and their effectiveness a lot earlier, she finally presented in January 2000, after the close of this funding. Her suggestions are and will be of great benefit to the transforming Council.

Landowner Appreciation Dinner: The CRMP sponsored a Landowner Appreciation Dinner on November 10, 1999 at the Greenview Grange. The purpose of the dinner is to show appreciation to those landowners who participate in restoration projects. The educational portion was an excellent presentation by Andrew Eller who gave a two-screen (one with GIS mapping and photos, the other with charts and statistics) analysis of the riparian planting portion of the Fay Lane Riparian Restoration Project funded by Cantara and the Wildlife Conservation Board.

Newsletters: One newsletter was published in July 1999. Another edition will be published at the beginning of February 2000 (See Section II).

Workshops: Because of the turmoil and lack of participation within the organization through this period, no workshops were held. The previous periods had been packed with six or seven workshops, and we are starting up again as I write.

Subwatershed Landowner Groups: The CRMP Coordinator has been facilitating four subwatershed landowner groups formally: Shackleford/Mill, Moffett Creek, South Fork of the Scott, and the Tailings Landowner Group. In addition, the Sugar Creek diverters have recently met to work on a project to pipe ditches. These groups offer an excellent forum for project planning and development.

- ♦ The Shackleford/Mill group has done some informal planning and many projects have been implemented in the watershed (riparian restoration, fish screens, and road improvement to abate sediment transport to stream).
- ♦ An Upland Gross Assessment project has been funded in Moffett Creek by the State Water Quality Control Board, partly as a result of the landowner group's input.
- ♦ The South Fork Group is working on doing their own road inventorying and road improvement, partly funded by the Task Force.
- ♦ The Tailings Committee is reviewing a project proposal to create a flood plain in the area in order to reduce the sediment contributions of the area to the system downstream.

- ♦ The Sugar Creek water diverters are looking for opportunities to reduce their water losses and, in turn, reduce their water rights by the amount saved through efficient transport (4cfs).

PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Subbasin Planning through the Technical Work Group and Humboldt State University:

The Coordinator has continuously worked with the Technical Work Group, Dr. Yvonne Everett, of the NRPI Department at HSU, and Carlin Finke, a graduate student who is using her planning assistance for the Council as part of her thesis project. Carlin has attended two CRMP/Council meetings and met with a community group for the purpose of identifying and locating limiting factors for anadromous fish and a healthy watershed. The process will continue through the spring of 2000. Its purpose and what has been achieved (draft) so far can be found in Section V.

Planning within the Council: The planning piece within the Scott River Watershed Council is just beginning. What the Council will chose to keep and what to discard of the CRMP plans is yet to be seen. The Standing Committees will be taking a look at the individual plans previously written in CRMP committees, *Fish Habitat and Population Plan*, *Fall Flows Action Plan*, *Upland Plan*, *Agriculture Plan*, and *Five Year Action Plan*. It is the Coordinator's hope that the planning processes of the Council and the TWG will coalesce in a way that will satisfy both the Council and the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force. The community process is just so slow and cumbersome. Now that the Council involves many new people, which is a very desirable condition, they need to be brought up to date on the planning status and process. If that happens too fast and without listening to each and every party on the issue, they all may go running out the door.

Council Projects and their Status:

The Council Coordinator, a Council member (Mary Roehrich), and an AmeriCorps steward have continued the historical video project by filming Pinky Bill Mathews in June. Other interviews are planned for 2000. We do not wish that the valuable information our elders hold in their memories be lost.

A current list of projects which have been approved, prioritized, and funded through proposals written by the Council and RCD can be found in Section VI.

CRMP/COUNCIL FUNDING (See Budget Summary and copies of invoices in Section VIII):

The CRMP VII funding cycle (\$25,000) from the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force has sustained the CRMP activities from May 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999. The funding for the months of May and December were partially sustained by previous and later funding cycles respectively. The Coordinator has also used funding through this period obtained from the California Department of Conservation \$6,000 for equipment and facilitation of subwatershed landowner groups.

Budget Summary

More was spent in the salaries category and less in the operations category, which covers workshop costs, for the reasons previously explained. More staff time in the areas of committee work, specifically Lorrie Bundy's help with the Monitoring and Water Committees, was also a cause. In addition, the Coordinator has spent more time on coordinating the education project

with the schools because of a change in project coordinators and the need for extra help in that area. Some, but not all of the Coordinator's time was charged to the education project.

In-kind and matching funds have been beyond proposal estimates. The Coordinator has very willingly and consistently housed and fed the Humboldt State graduate student who is helping with the subbasin planning, ten nights so far.

The usual volunteer participation in CRMP meetings was low through the summer, but for the last three months the Council attendance is averaging 30 people per meeting. The Ad hoc and Executive Committees have made up in meeting time for the usual standing committees in time committed.

CONCLUSION

The Scott River Watershed Council has entered a period of high hopes, high participation and some new beginnings. My hope is that the Council can learn from the mistakes and achievements of the Scott River Watershed CRMP. I see the new participation as an opportunity to reach and to educate a wider group of community members. Sari Sommarstrom's findings in studying various groups were that watershed groups had a difficult time staying connected with the community as a whole, and that those who reached the greatest number and cross-section ended up with the best plans and the most effective restoration projects. I wish that result for the Scott River Watershed Council.

TABLE OF APPENDICES

- I. Coordinator Job Description and Reports to Council
- II. Council Meeting Minutes and Standing Committee Meeting Notes
- III. Workshop information, Media Coverage and Newsletter
- IV. Facilitator's Survey, Results, and Recommendations
- V. Correspondence
- VI. Current Planning Drafts of Community Mapping of Limiting Factors
- VII. Project List
- VIII. Scott River Watershed Council's Beginning Process, Goals, and Membership
 - ..Invoices for Budget Summary

I

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COORDINATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNING GROUP (CRMP)

JOB DESCRIPTION CRMP COORDINATOR

The CRMP COORDINATOR will work under the direction of the chairman of the Scott River Watershed CRMP. The goals of the CRMP will be used to guide all CRMP activities. **The Coordinator is the one who “manages the vision, moves the group, and is responsible for completion of all the tasks”.** The Coordinator will work cooperatively with the Project Coordinator, Program Manager, and the Facilitator.

The Coordinator will be a consistent, familiar contact with both landowners and agency personnel. The Coordinator is to be constantly aware that a great deal of tact, patience, knowledge, and understanding will be critical in order to create and foster the long term relationships necessary to the success of this process.

Duties will include:

Meetings:

- CRMP meetings: coordinate with executive committee to help set the agenda, arrange for a speaker, provide reports, as needed, and publicity for the meeting.
- Sub-Committee meetings: work with the Sub-committee Chairs, provide speakers, help with research, write reports and develop or revise Plans as needed
- RCD Board meetings: report to the Board on CRMP activities and proposals needing their support.
- Task Force meetings: Defend proposals at the Technical Work Group and Task Force meetings, promote the CRMP at various other meetings.

Program Planning:

- Assist with fact finding, information sharing, data analysis
- Assist in developing new Plans and update existing ones

Projects:

- Work with Sub-committees in research and project development
- Search for funding sources
- Coordinate with Project Coordinator in preparing proposals, submitting to CRMP committee, RCD Board, and the funding agency
- Assist in documenting each project, including before and after photos

Field Trips / Workshops:

- Organize educational workshops for the CRMP group and the community: Seek funding, select topic, secure speakers, arrange location and date, publicize, etc.
- Organize informative tours for Task Force or agencies

Publicity/PR:

- Write press releases / monthly
- Publish a newsletter / quarterly
- Develop a display for the fair booth
- Give presentations, slide shows, etc. as needed

Correspondence:

- Write letters on issues of concern as directed
- Respond to requests for information / materials

Information Management:

- Identify and obtain needed reference materials, help organize office library
- Maintain records of CRMP efforts
- Record history of area through old photos, newspaper clippings, taped memories of local residents
- Be trained on use of Klamath Resource Information System (KRIS)
- Coordinate with other CRMP Coordinators and staff members
- Assist in preparing final reports

Estimated hours / monthly average: 60 - 80

- 15 - 50 Meetings (depends on what the Sub-committees want)
- 10 Program Planning
- 10-20 Projects and proposal writing
- 5 Field Trips
- 5 Publicity - PR
- 5 Correspondence
- 5 Information management

Some months will focus more on one area than others - this is a rough estimate.

CRMP Coordinator's Report - 6/15/99

I. Subwatershed Groups

The South Fork Landowners Group has worked on a protocol to be used for their road inventory in the South Fork watershed as per Larry Alexander's report to you this evening. Larry, Don Elder (USFS), Warren Farnam, who will be Project Coordinator for the implementation project, and myself met on June 2nd to work out any inconsistencies in protocol there may have been between the South Fork landowners' and the USFS'. I presently sending out a letter to all the landowners in my South Fork database about the state of the inventory and inviting their participation.

I am planning a field trip and picnic in July for the Shackleford/Mill Landowners at their request. The purpose will be to see some of the projects which have been implemented there, view some potential project sites, and to do a little PFC (Properly Functioning Condition) discussion in some of the areas. This was John Menke's idea and a good one. This group loves to eat.

I have sent out a letter to the Moffett Creek Landowners' Group informing them of the Moffett Creek Gross Assessment proposal I just completed.

As a proposal written by Tom Hesseldenz for the tailings area has been funded by the USFWS Tom and Larry Alexander are requesting that that group be reactivated. I think that an invitation should be extended to Tom to talk to the CRMP about the project.

II. Workshops:

I am ready for ideas for a fall workshop. What do you think?

III. RCD/CRMP Relationship:

I have been requested by the RCD to write up a description of the RCD/CRMP relationship. The RCD flinched somewhat at the idea of a MOU or MOA (memorandum of understanding or agreement), but felt that just a written clarification might be appropriate. The RCD/CRMP Relationship Committee will have first crack at reviewing the brief description; then it will go to the RCD and CRMP.

IV. Proposals:

I just finished writing the Moffett Creek Upland Gross Assessment proposal and submitted it to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). I have a copy here for your review. I had little to no confidence in writing it, but a wonderful new person at the North Coast Region office helped me out and bolstered my confidence. Her name is Janet Blake.

The Jobs-in-the-Woods (etc.) Request for Proposals is out and due on August 31th. This year a little money (\$100,000) has been set aside for assessment and planning.

Lorrie and I defended Task Force CRMP proposals in Ashland last Thursday. We done good.

V. Subbasin Planning:

On June 3rd I met with other subbasin coordinators and a Humboldt State professor, Yvonne Everett, and two grad students who are helping out with subbasin planning by taking us all through a planning process in three to four meetings. The outcome of the meetings is supposed to be a planning project (thesis for one of the graduate students) and GIS support for it (the other grad student's area of expertise). This is funded by the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force through the TWG. I also gave the three Humboldt folks a quick tour of the Scott.

CRMP Coordinator's Report to Council - 9/21/99

Announcements:

- ♦ I'm pleased to introduce the new AmeriCorps volunteer: Danielle Quigley.
- ♦ I'm going to be a grandmother and Gary is going to be a double Dad.

I. Subwatershed Groups

- ♦ The Shackleford/Mill landowners will meet in early October to work on a subwatershed planning process.
- ♦ The Tailings landowners will also be meeting in October so that Tom Hesseldenz can explain the present and prospective projects for the area.

II. Workshops:

Ideas for workshops for the fall 1999:

- ♦ Fish and Game would like to do a workshop for training landowners for the new, more involved, longer, more expensive 1603 process.
- ♦ Training for landowners to develop effective project proposal ideas.
- ♦ Ranch and Watershed Training Course – another session of approximately 10 landowners
- ♦ Riparian planting – Andrew Eller will bring an idea to next CRMP meeting.
- ♦ The Water Committee has suggested a workshop to train landowners to measure flow and to inform them on the adjudication.
- ♦ Bring in ranchers/farmers who have successfully made transition to management practices which minimize impacts to streams and have learned how to live with the ESA and CWA (Martin Andreas, contact).
- ♦ Panel discussion of Board of Forestry rules package for watershed protection.

III. Proposals:

- ♦ Two proposals made the JITW deadline: Water Temperature Monitoring and Scott River Geomorphic Analysis (a proposal presented to the Task Force, but unfunded so far).

IV. Conferences

- ♦ At Sari Sommarstrom's invitation I attended a Watershed Management Council Forum on watershed groups on September 1st in Davis. Government and agency representatives and watershed council coordinators from four different states attended. The purpose was to learn from each others' way of doing things. The emphasis was on the government/watershed group relationship. Massachusetts, Oregon, Washington and California participated. Sari did a great job of selecting a good cross-section of people.

V. Webpage

The Webpage is up but under construction. You can reach the webpage by either clicking on the Scott River Watershed CRMP Council on the "Users' Homepage" list on the Sisqtel homepage or type in the address: www.sisqtel/~sisqrcd/. I would be glad to receive any ideas on making it fun and interesting.

VI. Projects:

- ♦ The edited video of Orel Lewis' interview that was done by the AmeriCorp Steward, Paloma Galindo, and aired on Yreka Community TV is available on video at the RCD Office. Anyone wanting view it is welcome to check it out. It is really quite good.
- ♦ I am preparing a semester report on the Water Conservation through Improved Irrigation Management Practices. John Bennett and Steve Orloff have been running the project this summer with 10 landowners and will be doing the same with 10 more next summer. System analysis and recommendations have been done for all and the irrigation is really winding down. The good news is that many of the participating ranchers are buying additional sensors to use in other fields. Data has not all been analyzed yet. I have yet to speak to Steve Orloff, but according to the project proposal, we will be publishing a brochure this fall on the project and the opportunities using this equipment.

CRMP Coordinator's Report - 7/20/99

I. Subwatershed Groups

We held a South Fork meeting to give smaller landowners an opportunity to be involved in the road inventory process. Only one small landowner attended, but their small amount of road, it was agreed, will be included in the road inventory. Timber Products wishes to go over the protocol data sheet again with the others, as they just discovered some concerns. There will be a meeting on July 26th to address that concern.

The Shackleford/Mill Landowners had a field trip and pot luck picnic on July 13th. The group visited project sites on Dick Dews' and Dan Hayden's ranches and looked at an example of road work to reduce sediment on Fruit Growers' property. They also viewed some sites on Mill Creek where the stream is aggrading and moving around a lot.

The Tailings Committee will meet on Thursday, July 22 at the Bilivar Grange in Callahan. Any CRMP member interested in joining that committee should, as the previous member is no longer here.

II. Workshops:

Two ideas for workshops for the fall:

Fish and Game would like to do a workshop for training landowners for the new, more involved, longer, more expensive 1603 process.

Training for landowners to develop effective project proposal ideas.

RangeMac – another session

III. RCD/CRMP Relationship:

Take a look at the DRAFT "Description of Siskiyou RCD/Scott River CRMP Relationship and submit written comments at or before the August meeting.

IV. Proposals:

The Jobs-in-the-Woods (etc.) Request for Proposals is out and due on August 31th. This year a little money (\$100,000) has been set aside for assessment and planning.

I am working with the Upland Committee to develop a proposal for JITW/CDF (Jobs-in-the-Woods/California Dept. of Forestry) funding.

Gary Black has a couple of landowners interested in projects appropriate for JITW funding.

V. Subbasin Planning:

On July 8th I met with Dave Webb, Humboldt State professors, Yvonne Everett and Steve Steinberg as well as two grad students who are helping out with subbasin planning by taking us all through a planning process in three to four meetings. The outcome of the meetings is supposed to be a planning project (thesis for one of the graduate students) and GIS support for it (the other grad student's area of expertise). We also met with the Technical Work Group to explain the process to them. Carlin Finke, one the grad students is here at the CRMP meeting to observe the CRMP process.

VI. Outreach

The newsletter will be out by the end of the month. I am running behind on it.

CRMP Coordinator's Report to Council - 10/19/99

Announcements:

The Task Force honored Sue Maurer with the Nat Bingham individual award and the Scott River Watershed CRMP Council with the organizational award at their meeting in Yreka last Friday. As I said at the meeting, everyone who has been a part of the process deserves a lot of credit. And we are certainly proud of Sue.

Subwatershed Groups

- ♦ The Shackleford/Mill landowners met on October 5th to work on a subwatershed planning process. Food brought the folks back. They came up with several aspects of the visioning process that I was using to try to establish a sort of mission statement or description of a target condition. Everyone decided that they needed more information on the historical condition of the streams that are so aggraded in places that they have the dual disadvantage of blocking fish passage and making the stream bed spread everywhere.
- ♦ The Tailings landowners met on October 12th so that Tom Hesseldenz could explain the present and prospective projects for the area. Tom is ready and willing to address the CRMP Council on the same topic. The reactions of the Tailings landowners were mixed but mostly positive. There will be another meeting soon to decide where to go next.

I. Workshops:

Ideas for workshops for 1999-2000 were prioritized in the following order in the September CRMP meeting:

1. Fish and Game would like to do a workshop for training landowners for the new, more involved, longer, more expensive 1603 process.
2. Ranch and Watershed Training Course – another session of approximately 10 landowners
3. Training for landowners to develop effective project proposal ideas.
4. Panel discussion of Board of Forestry rules package for watershed protection.
5. The Water Committee has suggested a workshop to train landowners to measure flow and to inform them on the adjudication.
6. Bring in ranchers/farmers who have successfully made transition to management practices which minimize impacts to streams and have learned how to live with the ESA and CWA (Martin Andreas, contact).
7. Riparian planting expert, June Davis, to do field trip/workshop. (It was decided that it would be preferable to send Andrew Eller to June instead of having her come down here because she would be very expensive.

The Fish and Game 1603 workshops were well attended (about 25 people each) and the information was well presented. The clarification of the process served to calm a few nerves.

II. Projects:

- ♦ The RCD has granted a contract to Abner Weed as this year's Watershed Education Coordinator. Abner has been principal/teacher at Gazelle Elementary School for many years. He was a Seams Project participant and has been trained by Sue. We are lucky to have such a great guy.
- ♦ The Humboldt State University GIS/planning project for the Scott, Shasta, and Salmon Rivers involves a community mapping process which uses local, in-the-know people to map the condition of streams and riparian areas. Anyone interested in participating in such a process should contact Jeffy. The Tech Committee will be involved for sure. A prospective date for the exercise is November 5th.

CRMP Coordinator's Report to Council - 11/16/99

Announcements:

On Thursday evening at 7:00 pm at the Fort Jones Community Center, there will be a Community Mapping process meeting held to identify limiting factors in the Scott River watershed. The public is invited. Those who have specific knowledge of the watershed are encouraged to attend.

I. Subwatershed Groups

- ◆ Shackleford/Mill landowners met Monday, November 1st. Don Howell was there to address the group's concern over gravel build-up in various places where roads, bridges, and pasture may be taken out in high water. Don suggested that a meeting with Ron Presley (DFG) and Michael Lamprecht (ACE) might be in order to determine the feasibility of removing the gravel.
- ◆ The Tailings landowners will be meeting again on or about December 14th to decide whether or not there are enough willing landowners to make a project in the whole tailings reach possible.

II. Workshops/Public Gatherings

- ◆ The Landowner Recognition Dinner was held on Wednesday, November 10th. It was not real well attended but those who were there ate real well and saw and heard a great presentation by Andrew Eller on the Fay Lane Riparian Restoration Project. I have it on video for anyone interested.
- ◆ The next Ranch and Watershed Planning Course in the Scott Valley will be held the last two Monday evenings of January and one yet-to-be-announced in early February.

III. Committee Meetings

- ◆ The Adhoc Reorganization Committee has met once, Monday, October 25th, since the last CRMP meeting. You have received their recommendations.
- ◆ The Executive Committee met on Tuesday, November 2nd.
- ◆ The Water Committee met on Wednesday, November 3rd and reviewed the recommended actions and their own previously recommended actions to compile a prioritized list of recommended actions for the Fall Flows Action Plan. That list is on the table as a handout.
- ◆ Part of the Upland Committee went on a field trip on Saturday, November 13th to view possible project sites for a vegetation conversion project which would entail monitoring the site to see if increased flows were a result of the project. It was felt by the group in attendance that one of the sites viewed was ideal for such a project.
- ◆ The Monitoring Committee also met, but I was not present.

IV. Projects:

- ◆ I am in the process of buying equipment and a storage facility for Etna Union High School District's Natural Resource Academy and this year's Watershed Education Program with funds which were left from last year's Program. The teachers and the program's community advisory group has had the input as to what equipment should be obtained.
- ◆ The planning project which I am doing with Carlin Finke, the Humboldt State graduate student is under way. The Community Mapping exercise to take place Thursday is part of that effort. Also, it will be discussed on Wednesday, November 17th at the Klamath Task Force Technical Work Group's meeting.
- ◆ Stream Care Guide: I have consulted with Jan Mathews of the Redwood Community Action Agency. The estimate of costs are \$1,500 for 500 copies and \$2,400 for 1000 copies. I have written letters to NRCS and the Siskiyou County Fish and Game Commission requesting \$500 each for help with publishing costs.

Council Coordinator's Report to Scott River Watershed Council - 12/14/99

Announcements:

I will be out of town from December 22, 1999 to January 10, 2000. Please feel free to call me at (315) 685-6954 (Skaneateles, NY) with questions or needs.

I. Subwatershed Groups

- ♦ The Tailings landowners will be meeting again on January 20, 2000 to decide whether or not there are enough willing landowners to make a project in the whole tailings reach possible.
- ♦ A Sugar Creek group of water users has met once and is looking into the feasibility of piping irrigation ditches to conserve water.

II. Workshops/Public Gatherings

- ♦ The next Ranch and Watershed Planning Course in the Scott Valley will be held the last two Monday evenings of January, the 24th and the 31st at 7 p.m. and one yet-to-be-announced in early February.


III. Committee Meetings

There has not been much committee activity this month due to the reorganization status of the Watershed Council. Hopefully that will change as of this evening.

- ♦ The committee set up to write up a draft of Principles and Goals of the Scott River Watershed Council met on November 23rd and you have been provided a draft of that document along with the agenda for this meeting.

IV. Projects:

- ♦ I have bought equipment including a GPS unit and a storage facility for Etna Union High School District's Natural Resource Academy and this year's Watershed Education Program with funds which were left from last year's Watershed Ed Program.
- ♦ A small group of people met on November 18th to go through a community mapping process to establish some of the site-specific limiting factors for anadromous fish in the Scott River watershed. The results will be mapped by Carlin Finke, a Humboldt State graduate student, and returned to the group and anyone else who wants to add input. The next community mapping meeting is planned for January 12, 2000 at 8:30 at the Forest Service Compound conference trailer in Fort Jones (Bridge Street).
- ♦ Stream Care Guide: Dennis Maria, CDFG, and Randy Seelbrede, NRCS, will be reporting on the status of funding for the Guide.
- ♦ The Landowner Outreach funds which have been helping with the organization of subwatershed landowner groups will be ending December 31st. I am confident that Watershed Council funding can cover the continuation of the facilitation of these groups if the Council chooses to support that activity.
- ♦ I attended one day of KRIS (Klamath Resource Information System) training last week. The newest, and most useful yet, version is in the RCD office. It is now on a CD that can be used to run the program so that if your computer does not have enough memory, you can still take a look. For the Scott River there is water temperature data, project information and photos, aerial photos, and more.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Ph. (530) 467-3798, Fax (530) 467-3728
Email jeffvdm@sisqtel.net Website www.sisqtel.net/~sisqrcd/

Council Coordinator's Report to Scott River Watershed Council - 1/18/00

Announcements:

- ♦ I had a wonderful holiday with my family. I hope that yours was relaxing and filled with cheer.
- ♦ The Ranch Water Quality Workshop deadline for sign-up is tomorrow, January 19, 2000. The dates of the workshop are January 24 and 31, with the third date as tentatively February 14th.

I. Subwatershed Groups

- ♦ The Tailings landowners will be meeting again on February 7, 2000 to fill in the affected parties and landowners on changes to the project. A draft restoration agreement, which outlines the obligations of the various parties involved in the proposed project, will be submitted for comment
- ♦ The South Fork landowners involved in the road inventory

II. Workshops/Public Gatherings

- ♦ The next Ranch Water Quality Workshop will be held at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview the last two Monday evenings of January, the 24th and the 31st at 7 p.m. and a third tentative date of February 14th.


III. Committee Meetings

- ♦ All the committees should be prepared to meet within the next four weeks to select their representative and alternate to serve on the Executive Committee, which is the voting body of the Watershed Council. Please gather at the end of this Council meeting to select a date and let me know what it is. Consider day meetings as a possibility.

- ♦ In my view, my duties to help out committees are the following:
 - Coordinating meeting by notifying (reminding, when needed) all members and making any arrangements.
 - Supplying cookies and coffee or tea,
 - Taking group notes,
 - Implementing actions when needed, and being the over-all support,
 - Supply resource materials when needed,
 - Any others the committee deems useful.

IV. Projects:

- ♦ On January 12, 2000, there was a second meeting to map limiting factors for salmon and steelhead in the Scott River watershed. This process is part of a planning effort which will culminate, hopefully, in a Scott River Watershed Action Plan. More factors and some additional sites were identified after reviewing the list from last meeting. Another such meeting will be held in March. I will be sure to notify the public of the time and place.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Ph. (530) 467-3798, Fax (530) 467-3728
Email jeffvdm@sisqtel.net Website www.sisqtel.net/~sisqrcd/

Council Coordinator's Report to Scott River Watershed Council - 1/18/00

Announcements:

- ♦ I had a wonderful holiday with my family. I hope that yours was relaxing and filled with cheer.
- ♦ The Ranch Water Quality Workshop deadline for sign-up is tomorrow, January 19, 2000. The dates of the workshop are January 24 and 31, with the third date as tentatively February 14th.

I. Subwatershed Groups

- ♦ The Tailings landowners will be meeting again on February 7, 2000 to fill in the affected parties and landowners on changes to the project. A draft restoration agreement, which outlines the obligations of the various parties involved in the proposed project, will be submitted for comment
- ♦ The South Fork landowners involved in the road inventory

II. Workshops/Public Gatherings


- ♦ The next Ranch Water Quality Workshop will be held at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenvew the last two Monday evenings of January, the 24th and the 31st at 7 p.m. and a third tentative date of February 14th.

III. Committee Meetings

- ♦ All the committees should be prepared to meet within the next four weeks to select their representative and alternate to serve on the Executive Committee, which is the voting body of the Watershed Council. Please gather at the end of this Council meeting to select a date and let me know what it is. Consider day meetings as a possibility.
- ♦ In my view, my duties to help out committees are the following:
 - Coordinating meeting by notifying (reminding, when needed) all members and making any arrangements,
 - Supplying cookies and coffee or tea,
 - Taking group notes,
 - Implementing actions when needed, and being the over-all support,
 - Supply resource materials when needed,
 - Any others the committee deems useful.

IV. Projects:

- ♦ On January 12, 2000, there was a second meeting to map limiting factors for salmon and steelhead in the Scott River watershed. This process is part of a planning effort which will culminate, hopefully, in a Scott River Watershed Action Plan. More factors and some additional sites were identified after reviewing the list from last meeting. Another such meeting will be held in March. I will be sure to notify the public of the time and place.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Ph. (530) 467-3798, Fax (530) 467-3728
Email jeffvdm@sisqtel.net Website www.sisqtel.net/~sisqrcd/

Council Coordinator's Report to Scott River Watershed Council - 2/15/00

Announcements:

- ♦ There will be a field trip (inside if weather does not permit) on Juniper Management on Wednesday, March 8, 2000 beginning with an introduction from 9:00 to 9:30 am at the Scott Valley Grange, Greenview and going all day, hopefully, in the field. The presenter is Dr. Richard Miller, professor of Rangeland Resources stationed at the Eastern Oregon Agricultural Station in Burns, Oregon. A wonderful sack lunch will be provided.
- ♦ Another, the third, Community Mapping meeting for identifying site specific limiting factors for anadromous fish and a healthy watershed: Monday, March 20, 2000 at 8:30 am at the US Forest Service conference trailer in the Compound on Bridge Street in Fort Jones. (turn down Scott River Road from Route 3, after about ¼ mile, turn right on Bridge Street, after three houses the Compound is on the right. The conference trailer is at the back of the compound.)
- ♦ The Cooperative Extension put on a great Growers' Seminar this week in Yreka. The Scott River Watershed Council's Irrigation Management project was highlighted along with speakers on such topics as landowner temperature monitoring, conservation easements, and *Causes for Decreasing Scott River Flows*, a study done by Dan Drake.
- ♦ I am leaving the country to attend at the birth of my first grandchild. I will be gone from February 17th until March 10th. In the interim please address Council requests and information to Carolyn at the RCD office, 467-3975.
- ♦ The winter and first Council newsletter will be mailed out next week.

I. Subwatershed Groups


- ♦ The South Fork landowners involved in the road inventory met in January to review what inventory work has been and what needs yet to be done. They have a map with all the road owners/managers filled in. Fruit Growers have not yet done their inventory, but it will be done early this summer. The implementation of the actual road work, which will probably mostly be done on Fruit Growers roads, needs also to be accomplished summer/fall of 2000. It will be a push.
- ♦ The Tailings landowners met on February 7, 2000 in Callahan. Tom Hesseldenz, Hesseldenz and Associates, filled landowners in on a prospective project in the tailings and proposed changes to the project. A draft restoration agreement, which outlines the obligations of the various parties involved in the proposed project, had been mailed out for comment. The project will not move forward unless landowner agreement is obtained from all the landowners in the project area.

II. Workshops/Public Gatherings

- ♦ The last of the three sessions of the Ranch Water Quality Workshop was held at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview last night, February 14th. People from ten ranches participated and wrote plans for their operations.
- ♦ See announcement above about juniper workshop.

III. Committee Meetings

- ♦ All the Standing Committees and the Interim Executive Committee have met since the last Council meeting in January. There is a written report from each.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Ph. (530) 467-3798, Fax (530) 467-3728
Email jeffvdm@sisqtel.net Website www.sisqtel.net/~sisqrcd/

Council Coordinator's Report to Scott River Watershed Council - 3/21/00

Announcements:

- ◆ I have a beautiful grandson named Emil Samuel born on February 24, 2000 in Almirante, Panama. He weighed 7 lb 7oz and is gaining fast.
- ◆ The Requests for Proposals (RFP's) have arrived from two major funding entities, the California Department of Fish and Game and the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force (USFWS). The project proposals are due by May 5, 2000 and May 1, 2000 respectively.
- ◆ I will be doing a slide presentation and taking the Technical Work Group of the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force on a tour of the Scott on April 5 and 6. If anyone is interested in attending or having input, please let me know. The TWG's intent is to understand the issues and conditions here enough to be able to help with the planning process.

I. Subwatershed Groups

- ◆ None of the subwatershed landowner groups has met since the February meeting.

II. Workshops/Public Gatherings

- ◆ A Juniper Management Workshop and Field Trip were held on March 8, 2000. Dr Richard Miller, professor of Rangeland Resources stationed at the Eastern Oregon Agricultural Station in Burns, Oregon, did a presentation with slides before taking the group of 18 people into the field in the Moffett Creek area. See attached report written by Danielle Quigley, AmeriCorps member.

III. Committee Meetings


- ◆ All the Standing Committees and the Executive Committee have met since the last meeting and reports from each committee and the calendar of the next meeting dates is attached.

IV. Projects:

- ◆ The dinner meeting of growers who participated in the project, Water Conservation through Improved Irrigation Management Techniques, was postponed due to a health problem.

V. Planning:

- ◆ A small group of community members met yesterday to continue work on mapping of limiting factors to a healthy watershed in the Scott watershed. This planning project is being led by Carlin Finke, a Humboldt State graduate student. The final product is scheduled for completion by the end of summer, 2000. A wider participation is being sought and a draft document will come to the SRWC for review and comment.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Ph. (530) 467-3798, Fax (530) 467-3728
Email jeffvdm@sisqtel.net Website www.sisqtel.net/~sisqrcd/

Council Coordinator's Report to Scott River Watershed Council - 4/18/00

I. Subwatershed Groups

A group of Sugar Creek diverters met at my home on April 13th to discuss the Sugar Creek Ditch Piping proposal. As soon as proposals are written after the first week of May, both the Shackleford/Mill Landowner Group and the Moffett Creek Group will be meeting.

II. Workshops/Public Gatherings

Ken Tate from the Davis UC Extension, Dan Drake's counterpart there, will be here for an interactive dialogue with landowners on May 18, 2000 and showing how the UCCE California Rangeland Water Quality Survey and the UCCE Sediment Inventory Methodology can be used by private landowners on their own land. He will also show the results of working with Regional Water Quality Board staff, CFBF, and ranchers on the north coast in using these methods.

III. Committees

All the Standing Committees, the Executive Committee, and the Technical Committee (2 times) have met since the last meeting and reports from each committee and the calendar of the next meeting dates is attached.

IV. Proposals:

Proposals to be submitted to the CA Department of Fish and Game and to the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force are due by May 5th and May 1st respectively. The Siskiyou RCD is having a special meeting on April 27th to review the proposals as recommended by the Scott River Watershed Council.

V. Projects:


- ◆ The dinner meeting of the 10 growers and their families who participated in the project, Water Conservation through Improved Irrigation Management Techniques, was held on April 11, 2000 at Bob's Ranch House. Steve Orloff, UC Extension, Yreka, presented results from the first year of this two-year project, which included recommendations to the individual growers to make their systems and/or schedules more efficient.
- ◆ Mary Roerhich and I interviewed Clarence Dudley on April 3, 2000. We have a full two hours on video. He was most loquacious and interesting. He had a great deal of information on the Noyes Valley area from 1945 until the 1970's.

VI. Planning:

- ◆ I have upgraded the "Planning Cookbook" to include the Executive Summary, which includes the planning history of the Council and CRMP, the CRMP's various plans and their revisions, the current draft document on limiting factors in the basin as brought forward in three community mapping meetings, and other assorted pieces of information. This marks the official launching of the "Planning Cookbook", a composite of all and any watershed or pertinent information which will help in the drafting of a Strategic Action Plan next year. Please feel free to contribute information and to solicit information

from others. I will have a copy to each committee at their next meeting and try to keep up with the influx of material. Anything too voluminous to include directly in the "Cookbook" will be referenced and kept in the Siskiyou RCD office on a designated shelf.

- ◆ I presented information and showed slides on the Scott River Watershed and the Council to the Technical Work Group of the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force on April 5, 2000. On April 6th I also took six of them on a tour which included two planting projects, one guided by Gary Black, and fish screens as well as an over-all view of the watershed from the canyon to above Callahan. The purpose of all this is to get their input on our planning efforts. I am scheduled to meet with them again at the end of August to follow up on their input.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Ph. (530) 467-3798, Fax (530) 467-3728
Email jeffvdm@sisqtel.net Website www.sisqtel.net/~sisqrtd/

Watershed Council Coordinator's Report to Siskiyou RCD - 6/1/00

I. Subwatershed Groups

The Moffett Creek Landowners met at noon on May 25, 2000, although not many showed up, to discuss the Moffett Creek Upland Gross Assessment and to line out the field trip with Ken Tate, the Davis UC Extension Watershed Specialist. The field trip on May 30th actually included many more landowners, probably due mostly to the efforts of Ric and Judy Costales to make phone calls. The group visited sites along Moffett and on Fruit Growers Supply land up Sissal Gulch. Many questions were asked of Ken as people are concerned about being held responsible for the evident sediment that flows from Moffett Creek in high water events. The group thought that they would get rid of Joe Santos and I by locking us in, but we escaped.

The Shackleford/Mill Landowners met to discuss the CDFG 1603 permit issue. It seems that there is a bit of inconsistency in how the various diverters with very similar situations are being treated. Some are getting by on old permits, others have to reapply but they go right through, yet others have been having a very difficult time complying with regulations because the CDFG cannot tell them how to do it. The one thing that all felt would be useful is some help with hydrologic/geomorphologic engineering and some funding to reconfigure or do whatever needed to be done to comply with fisheries mandates.

II. Workshops/Field Trips

Ken Tate, Watershed Specialist from the Davis UC Extension, came on May 30th for a field trip up Moffett Creek and a presentation at the Greenview Grange in the evening. Both events were well attended and many questions were fired Ken's direction. His presentation was on TMDL's, a sediment monitoring study he did on ten ranches on the coast, and his work with Garcia Watershed landowners who have gone and are still going through the TMDL process. A great spaghetti dinner was cooked by the Scott Valley Grange ladies accompanied by salad and dessert potluck food brought by the Council members. It was outstanding food.

III. Committees

All the Standing Committees, the Executive Committee, and the Technical Committee (2 times) have met since the last meeting and will meet again before the June Council meeting. I have reports on each committee meeting for anyone who would like a copy.

IV. Proposals:

Fourteen (14) proposals for twelve (12) different projects were submitted to the CDFG and to the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force as per those reviewed at the last special RCD meeting. The fully written proposals are available for you to read as you wish. I defended three proposals today before the TWG of the Task Force in Ashland.


V. Projects:

Mary Roerhich and I have a date to interview Beulah King and perhaps her son Bud Simas on June 7th.

VI. Planning:

I will be presenting a report to the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force on June 29th using the new equipment purchased in conjunction with the other subwatersheds.

II



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL MINUTES

APRIL 18, 2000
United Methodist Church, Etna

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order at 7:10 p.m. by Gareth Plank, Chairman
- Introductions – 20 in attendance.
- Rules for Conduct were read and elaborated on by Jeffy, Coordinator
- Minutes of March 21, 2000: Consensus of the Council approved the minutes as mailed with no correction or changes.
- The Agenda was approved and accepted by consensus as posted.
- Announcements:
 - Lorrie Bundy, Project Coordinator has accepted the position of Area Engineer with NRCS and will work out of the Weaverville Field Office serving Weaverville, Redding, and Yreka offices.
 - Andrew Eller is leaving to work in Alaska for a season.
- Open Forum: (3-minute presentations) - None

OLD BUSINESS

STATUS OF PLANNING “COOKBOOK”: Jeffy shared the “Cookbook” binder and reported on contents so far, and will have more information in her written report to the Council later in this meeting.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REVIEW & RECOMMENDATIONS for PRIORITY OF PROPSALS

Members that participated on the Technical Committee review were Gary Black, Jennifer Silveira, Jay Powers (briefly), Sari Sommarstrom, Dennis Maria, and Jeffy (non-voting coordinator). The Rating Form for Scott River CRMP Sponsored Proposals plus one-page summaries of each project was distributed to the Council for review. Discussion. Agreement that the ranking form needs more work, but number order was not important at this time as all 12 proposals can be and are worthy of being written. Tom Hesseldenz has written one proposal (in addition to the 12 proposals) for the Scott River Floodplain Restoration Study & Feasibility Phases and is sending out landowner agreement packets today. The Council agreed that the Hesseldenz “Study” should address how any lands could be affected in a hydrological sense as an integral and essential part of the study.

- ♦ Larry Toelle motioned / Ric Costales seconded to delete the Hesseldenz proposal from the list of proposals under consideration for lack of landowner agreements at this time. Passed.
- ♦ Ric Costales motioned / Wing Hodas seconded for the Council Coordinator to send a letter to Tom Hesseldenz stating that his proposal was deleted from consideration at this time for lack of landowner support and that the Council would endorse the “Study & Feasibility Phases” upon full landowner support. Passed.
- ♦ The Council reached consensus to endorse 12 proposals as presented:

<u>Project Name:</u>	<u>Estimated Amount to Request:</u>
♦ Local Build Fish Screens IV or Scott River Fish Screening II	\$ 70,000
♦ Patterson Creek Enhancement Project	\$ 55,000

♦ Scott River Watershed Council Coordination	\$ 55,000
♦ Fish Screen User's Handbook	\$ 9,054
♦ Scott River Subbasin Strategic and Action Plan	\$ 30,000
♦ Sugar Creek Flow Enhancement Through Diversion Piping	\$ 1 million
♦ Etna Creek Road Inventory	\$ 55,000
♦ Scott River Monitoring Plan (2-Year Continuation)	\$ budget not ready
Temperature Monitoring on the Scott River (option for 2-Year Plan above) year 1 only	\$ 7,482
♦ Scott River Basin Water Balance Phase II	\$ 50,000
♦ Etna Union High School Watershed Education Program	\$ 12,000
♦ Water Conservation & Fisheries Improvement / Protection	\$250,355
♦ Scott River Enhancement Project <u>or</u> Plank In-Stream Enhance.	\$ budget not ready

COMMENTS ON REGULATORY PROPOSALS: Discussion. Ric Costales presented background that regulatory actions can have an impact on our watershed, and that aspects that are counter or in conflict with the mission, goals, and objectives of the Council be considered.

- ♦ **The Council agreed that the Education and Community Relations Committees, and the staff should disseminate information to the Council and community in a variety of ways best determined by topic, subject matter, and/or level of community interest.**

NEW BUSINESS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LINK: Jeffy gave background on County representation on old CRMP.

- ♦ **Ric Costales motioned / Mary Roehrich seconded the importance for the County to have an understanding of the watershed and to request the Board of Supervisors to take a more active role in the Council, specifically request attendance by Jim DePree, and for the Community Relations Committee to draft a statement. Passed.**

SHORT REPORTS

- ♦ **Standing Committees:** Oral summaries were given by each committee chair on the written reports that were distributed to the Council at this meeting. Committee Chairs are as follows: Land – Ernie Wilkinson, Education – Gareth Plank, Community Relations – Ric Costales, Water – Mike Bryan, and Monitoring – Andrew Eller. Since Andrew and Lorrie are leaving this committee needs more members. Fish – Larry Toelle. Jim Kilgore reported on out-migrant trapping efforts 1 ½ miles above Scott Bar since March 19th. Weather events have made it interesting with fluctuation in cfs from 1100 to 2500. They are working to make the trap maneuverable to capture out migrating fish to get an idea of how many fish the watershed is producing. They mark, release, and recapture. They collect scale samples, do a fish health analysis, and do some work collecting water quality data. By July he will have a more detailed report with photos.
- ♦ **Staff** – Jeffy presented a written report covering activity of subwatershed groups, up-coming visit and presentation by Ken Tate in May, Standing Committee work, proposal writing, first-year summary presentation to participants in Irrigation Management project, video interview with Clarence Dudley, upgrading the “Cookbook” to include the Executive Summary, planning history of the Council and CRMP, the current draft document on limiting factors, and an open invitation to contribute information and to solicit information from others. She also made a presentation of information and accompanying slides on the Scott River Watershed and the Council to the Technical Work Group of the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force on April 5 & 6 and took six TWG members on a tour of planting projects, fish

screens and overall view of the watershed from the canyon to above Callahan. The purpose was to get their input on our planning efforts.

- ◆ **Staff** – Gary reported on fish screen work with 5 in operation, one more complete tomorrow, another next week, and the Fish & Game happy with the project and use of local fabrication, metal work, and concrete. Riparian planting of 25 acres this year on the mainstem Scott, Moffett, and McAdam's from the north to south ends of the valley. High water caused some holdup. May need to consider hiring additional coordinator.
- ◆ **Staff** – Warren reported on pipeline proposal, irrigation sensor installation for second year of project, fish screen work with Lorrie, and Moffett Gross Assessment work.
- ◆ **Subwatershed Groups** – covered in Jeffy's report.

SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING: May 16, 2000 - Time & Location TBA
--

- ◆ **The Council reached consensus to forego the business meeting and focus on an educational format to be determined by the Education Committee with an informal BBQ/potluck? details to be worked out by the Executive Committee.**
- ◆ May 16, 2000 – Time & Location TBA - Ken Tate, U.C. Extension, Davis will make a presentation on California Rangeland Water Quality Survey and Sediment Inventory Methodology.
- ◆ June 20, 2000 – Council Business Meeting.


ADJOURNMENT By Gareth Plank, Chairman at 9:45 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel, SRWC Secretary

No Corrections _____ / Corrections as Indicated by Handwritten Insertions _____

Approved _____ Date _____
Chair

Minutes are subject to change/correction when submitted for approval at the next meeting, and do not become official until all appropriate signatures are affixed.
--



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL MINUTES

MARCH 21, 2000
Fort Jones Community Center

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order at 7:10 p.m. by Jeffy Davis Marx, Coordinator with those in attendance agreeing to proceed with the educational speaker presentation. Gareth Plank, Chairman arrived at 7:45 p.m.

EDUCATIONAL SPEAKER: Mike Haas, Humboldt State University graduate student, did not present his GIS website information his site is not yet up to the level he would like it to be for such a presentation. Instead, Richard Vanderwater, USFS Klamath Forest, described and provided examples of the Klamath GIS (Geographic Information System); he explained what it is, how it works, what it's used for, and the history of how it came to be. Of its many uses, custom mapping is made easy, and its power is in spatial analysis to build complicated models. It can take pieces of information, merge them together, and obtain a model with new information for assessments. Most of the cost of GIS is in data collection and entry. There are several levels of software ranging in price from \$1,500 to \$17,000 or more. Looking at data is free by accessing the Arc Explorer website funded by Klamath Task Force. After answering questions the Council thanked Richard for his interesting and useful presentation.

CALL TO ORDER continued with Chairman Plank:

- Introductions – 21 in attendance.
- Rules for Conduct were condensed by Coordinator to "Unite".
- Minutes of February 15, 2000: Ernie Wilkinson motioned/ Alan Kramer seconded to approved the minutes as mailed.
- The Agenda was approved with one modification of moving "Technical Committee Selection" to immediately after "Announcements".
- Announcements:
 - Gareth Plank has explored and recommends the juniper website for commercial uses of juniper wood (westernjuniper.com) that he learned about from the Juniper Workshop/Field Tour.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE SELECTIONS: The Council agreed on the following committee members although some have not yet been contacted (in no particular order): Jennifer Silveira, Tom Shorey with Mike Duguay as his alternate, Sari Sommarstrom, John Spencer, Dennis Maria, Gary Black, and Jay Power. Their next meeting is set for April 11th at 8:30 a.m. at the new Fish & Wildlife office on South Oregon Street in Yreka between Ranch Lane and Greenhorn. They will select their Chair, review and revise as needed the rating process developed by the past CRMP, and review some proposals.

SHORT REPORTS: Oral summaries were given by each committee chair on the written reports that were distributed to the Council at this meeting. Committee Chairs are as follows: Land – Ernie Wilkinson, Education – Gareth Plank, Community Relations – Ric Costales, Water – Wing Hodas, Fish – Larry Toelle, and Monitoring – Andrew Eller.

STAFF REPORTS:

- ◆ Gary Black reported on work progress on several fish screens with concrete work and screen fabrication. He has crews planting cuttings in rockwork with a backhoe, and planting 800 2-year old ponderosa pine trees. He is doing the final work for the Shackleford/Mill Road Erosion Inventory and writing the final report.
- ◆ Jeffy summarized her written report covering:
 - ◆ The birth of her grandson Emil Samuel born February 24, 2000 in Panama!
 - ◆ Requests for proposals from Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force (USFWS) due May 1st and Fish & Game (CDFG) due May 5th. She will be giving a slide presentation at the Technical Work Group of the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force meeting in Yreka with a tour of the Scott on April 5th and 6th.
 - ◆ Juniper Management Workshop & Field Tour was held on March 8th with Dr. Richard Miller, Ph.D. Eighteen people attended visited sites on Moffett Creek, and McConaughy Gulch.
 - ◆ All Standing Committees and Executive Committee have met since the last full Council meeting.
 - ◆ The dinner meeting for growers that participated in the Water Conservation through Improved Irrigation Management Techniques was postponed until further notice due to a health problem.
 - ◆ Another meeting was held March 20th for continuing work on mapping of limiting factors for a healthy Scott watershed. This planning project is being led by Carlin Finke, a Humboldt State graduate student. Wider community participation is sought. A draft document is due by the end of this summer and will be presented to SRWC for review and comment.
- ◆ Lorrie Bundy reported finishing up fish screens at 4 sites. Working on three final reports for two fish screens, and one temperature-monitoring project. She is working on 5 proposals consisting of monitoring, temperature, fish screens at two sites, a fish screen handbook, and water balance. She is preparing for the start of this year's funded monitoring project with the use of local subcontractors. There are still 5 fish screens yet to do this year and one scheduled for next year.
- ◆ Warren Farnam is working on pipeline project and writing a grazing plan for the Scott River Riparian project.
- ◆ **SUBWATERSHED GROUPS:** No reports.

OPEN FORUM: (3-minute presentations)

- ◆ Wing Hodas made suggestions for starting meetings on time.
- ◆ Gareth Plank made comment regarding starting meetings by 7:01 with whomever is in attendance.
- ◆ Ric Costales commented that the Board of Forestry proposed rules changes are extreme, not justified by science, would have adverse effects on Siskiyou County; and since the Council is dedicated to resource issues, the Council should make comments on rules, and/or provide an educational event on the subject. Alan Kramer continued the rules topic with the need for the rules to address specifics of individual watersheds, and that a Council sponsored educational meeting would be appropriate. Tom Shorey continued that the next rules package would be watershed specific. Short discussion followed with suggestion for the appropriateness of general comments regarding the rules from the Council, and any specific comments should be made on one's own individual behalf. Council agreed that "Board of Forestry Rules Comment" should be placed as an agenda item for the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

NOMINATION & ELECTION OF COUNCIL CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR:

Larry Toelle motioned and Alan Kramer seconded to accept the Executive Committee recommendation of Gareth Plank for Interim Chair for a period of time not to exceed one year. Passed by open vote by all present.

Larry Toelle motioned and Bernard Dowling seconded to accept the Executive Committee recommendation of Mike Bryan for Vice Chair with the understanding that he would not be available during summer months. Passed by open vote by all present.

SRWC / RCD DESCRIPTION OF RELATIONSHIP:

Alan Kramer motioned / Ric Costales seconded to approve the Draft Policy Siskiyou RCD / Scott River Watershed Council Description of Relationship with one word change from “educate” to “inform” in “The Council’s role is” paragraph. Passed.

STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCEDURE – FRAMEWORK FOR COOKBOOK:

Larry Toelle presented a suggestion for collecting watershed and resource data, history, information, and reference materials from council members / community. This information/data would be organized in a fashion to provide a framework for a strategic or long-range plan. He proposed that a three-ring binder be kept and maintained by each of the 6 Standing Committees, one for Jeffy-SRWC Coordinator, and one for the RCD; and that information be submitted accordingly as to their subject matter.

The Council reached consensus for using Larry’s “Cookbook” methodology for: 1. Immediately seeking funding for future (within 12 months) professional assistance necessary in assimilating “Cookbook” information/data for the development of a Strategic Long-Range Plan, and 2. Seeking a volunteer(s) to catalog data/information, archive and index the “Cookbooks”.

NEW BUSINESS:

PROPOSAL DEADLINES & COMMITTEE PROCESS TOWARD MEETING DEADLINES:

- ◆ Request for Proposals (RFP) are due May 1st & 5th
- ◆ All Standing Committees need to fill out the one-page “Format for Proposal” sheets for any projects they want to propose and submit them to the Technical Committee by April 10th so that they can be rated when the Tech. Comm. meets on April 11th. If anyone needs help formulating a project, contact Dennis, Gary, or anyone on the Tech. Comm. at least by April 5th so they can help you.
- ◆ All proposals MUST have landowner approval to be rated by the Technical Committee.

SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING: April 18, 2000 –Methodist Church, Etna

- ◆ Project Proposal Review
- ◆ Status on “Cookbook”
- ◆ Board of Forestry Rules Comment
- ◆ Education Committee Proposals for Educational Events


ADJOURNMENT: By Chair at 9:50 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel, SRWC Secretary

No Corrections _____ / Corrections as Indicated by Handwritten Insertions _____

Approved _____ Date _____
Chair

Minutes are subject to change/correction when submitted for approval at the next meeting, and do not become official until all appropriate signatures are affixed.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL MINUTES

FEBRUARY 15, 2000
United Methodist Church, Etna

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order at 7:08 p.m. by Mike Bryan, Temporary Chair
- Self-introductions – 26 in attendance.
- Rules for Conduct were read by Jeffy Davis Marx, Council Coordinator
- Minutes of January 18, 2000 approved by common consent with no corrections or additions.
- The Agenda was amended in the following ways and then approved by consensus:
 - Move V. B. 1. Background (Jeffy Marx) to I.F. (just after Announcements).
 - Add I. G. Ric Costales Report on the Task Force Meeting in Brookings
 - Add V.C. Scott River Watershed Council / Siskiyou RCD Relationship
- Announcements:
 - Jeffy -
 - Juniper Management Workshop/Field Trip on March 8th 9:00 to 9:30 a.m. at Greenview Grange then field tour to several sites with Dr. Richard Miller, Professor of Rangeland Resources of Eastern Oregon Agricultural Station, Burns, Oregon. A sack lunch will be provided. RSVP by March 1st.
 - The third meeting of Community Mapping for ID of site specific limiting factors for anadromous fish will be held March 20th 8:30 a.m., US Forest Service Compound Conference Trailer.
 - UC Extension Grower's Seminar was successfully held on February 10th in Yreka. One of the several featured topics was the first-year results on the Scott River Watershed Council/Siskiyou RCD Irrigation Management project.
 - Jeffy is leaving for Panama to be with her daughter for the birth of her first grandchild. She will be gone from February 17th to March 10th. Contact Carolyn at RCD office 467-3975 while she is gone.
 - The first Scott River Watershed Council newsletter – Winter Edition, will be mailed next week.
- Background on Planning - Jeffy Marx described in 10 minutes the highlights of what has taken place since 1992 with the CRMP and now with the Council. She also presented this synopsis in written form on the back of her Coordinator's Report.
- Ric Costales and Larry Toelle reported on the Task Force Meeting they attended in Brookings on February 10th & 11th. The specific issue of interest to the Council was Task Force funding for the Council which was questioned by KFA wanting to see this funding attached to a completed subbasin plan by September 2000. A plan needs to be seriously considered for these particular funds, but the Task Force expressed a willingness to be accommodating.

SPEAKER: Ron Iverson, US Fish & Wildlife Service Project Leader for the Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force spoke to the Council on Task Force funding parameters for Watershed Groups. Mr. Iverson gave a first hand background on the Task Force's charge. They were to write a Habitat Restoration amendment to include the Upper Klamath Basin, but by '90 – '91 it didn't pan out. Action Planning has been on-going for a

long time. Funding was made available in '92 for the Shasta basin and funding for subbasin planning ever since. Over 1 million dollars have been spent to promote restoration efforts with ¼ million dollars for the Scott alone. Mr. Iverson corroborated what Ric reported about the meeting in Brookings. The Klamath Task Force is not concerned about how a council is organized. Its interest is in the products in operating plans. There is not one single operating plan completed in the entire basin. The Klamath Basin consists of 16,000 sq. miles with five watersheds. This year the funding share that goes into planning will be increased from 30% to 40%. This means an average of \$231,000 will be available for planning and coordinators with an amount of \$125,000 available for local watershed groups. \$10,000 for the Technical Working Group (TWG), \$90,000 for technical support to help get plans done. The focus will be on operating plans in FY 2001. The Task Force wants to see language in current agreements, which are still in draft form, that subbasin groups have the intention to accomplish an operating plan, but the Task Force will not be dictating a timeline. Subbasins should demonstrate a schedule to get a plan done. Mr. Iverson then entertained questions and comments from the Council.

OPEN FORUM: Discussion with Mr. Iverson continued:

Iverson - The Task Force is looking for plan content, not a particular ideology.

Council - "Content" is non-specific which makes it difficult for the Council to plan for.

Iverson - Task Force / TWG has developed a guide for strategic planning.

Council - to be acceptable, the community based plan must fit the science.

Iverson - There is considerable agreement in scientific community as to what is needed to restore anadromous fish.

Council - No plan can save fish, it is ideas that hit the ground with projects that can get to good stewardship. Intelligent planning has gone into the work that has been implemented.

Further Council comments on acknowledgement of past work - Strategic vs. tactical plans. Past plans need to be adopted and need a format from entities. Individual plans need to look at long-range goals and work for desired future condition and address limiting factors. We have plans and can devise plans for this Council's watershed. Principals of this Council are not just for fish, the whole community must be considered for a healthy community. Focus should be on all natural resources. Will this meet the needs of the Task Force?

Iverson - The Task Force hasn't expressed what it is they are after. Are local watershed councils capable to deal with hard issues with plans to satisfy the tough issues of ESA, TMDLs, and water allocations?

Council - What does "addressing" these issues mean?

Iverson - Lay out a way community would deal with regulatory problems.

Council - This Council does not want to be in a regulatory mechanism.

Mr. Iverson expressed that he would carry these issues and concerns back to the Task Force.

OLD BUSINESS:

PROCESS QUESTION: CONSIDER WORKING FOR CONSENSUS WITH EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SUPER-MAJORITY VOTE AS A FALL-BACK - Council discussion and agreement on the following:

- ◆ Can work toward consensus always as operation of intent, and if that doesn't work fall back on supermajority so that the whole group cannot be held hostage by one person.
- ◆ Follow rules of conduct.
- ◆ Follow Robert's Rules of Order.
- ◆ Important not to cut discussions short.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Gary did not have an opportunity to discuss the issue with Dennis Maria and feels that it is better that suggestion come from the community. Gary suggested that people suggest names, and that maybe regions could be created. Jeffy has made some contacts. **Three people volunteered: Tom Shorey, Jay Power, and Jennifer Silveira.** This issue is to be placed on the next agenda.

NEW BUSINESS:

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHARI (3 OPETIONS OFFERED BY EXEC. COMM.):

1. Rotate Chair within Executive Committee.
2. Elect Chair to serve for one-year term from Council at-large. **Larry Toelle motioned / Bernard Dowling seconded to defer the issue of Chair selection until the Executive Committee has had a chance to meet pending all Standing Committees have had an opportunity to take up this discussion within their committees, and the Executive Committee will select another temporary Chair to serve at the March Council meeting. Consensus.**
3. Use facilitator

PLANNING:

- ♦ Suggestion for responsibility within Council. **Larry Toelle motioned / Mary Roehrich seconded for the Council to assign the task of developing a long-range or strategic plan in each standing committee, and to document each committee's responses on a wall chart to be brought back to a full Council meeting to discuss and consider. Consensus**

SHORT REPORTS:

- ♦ A packet consisting of written Standing Committee reports, list of meeting dates, and list of current committee participants was distributed to the Council to review for correctness.

SRWC / RCD RELATIONSHIP:

- ♦ The Draft RCD/SRWC Relationship Description was distributed for review and future consideration.

SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING:

- ♦ Possible speaker – Mike Hass
- ♦ Technical Committee Membership Recommendations
- ♦ Council Chair Nominations and Election (for a one-year term)
- ♦ Long-Range/Strategic Planning Recommendations from each Standing Committee


ADJOURNMENT: By Chair at 9:45 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel, Recording Secretary

No Corrections _____ / Corrections as Indicated by Handwritten Insertions _____

Approved _____ Date _____
Facilitator / Chairperson

Minutes are subject to change/correction when submitted for approval at the next meeting, and do not become official until all appropriate signatures are affixed.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL MINUTES

JANUARY 18, 2000
Fort Jones Community Center

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order at 7:10 p.m. by Interim Chair, Gareth Plank.
- Self-introductions – 28 in attendance.
- The Coordinator, Jeffy Davis Marx, read rules of Conduct.
- Minutes of December 14, 1999 were approved by common consent with the following additions: Add Larry Toelle to the Community Relations Committee, add Dal Eckland to the Education Committee, and add Ken Fowle to the Fish & Wildlife Committee.
- The Agenda was amended by adding to Old Business - A. 1 – Role of Agencies, and A. 2 - Other Issues. Amended agenda approved by common consent.
- Announcements:
 - Jeffy announced the Ranch Water Quality Workshop will be held on January 24, 31, and February 14. Deadline is January 19 to sign up for this workshop.

SPEAKER: Jeffy introduced Sari Sommarstrom, Ph.D. Dr. Sommarstrom spoke about her contribution to the study, “An Evaluation of Selected Watershed Councils in the Pacific Northwest and Northern California”, published November 1999. This study was comprised of three parts. The first part dealt with the evaluation of watershed council effectiveness, and the third part with comparisons and contrasts. Part II: “The Process of Council Operations” was prepared by Dr. Sommarstrom. She gave background on councils included in the study, and spoke on all three parts of the study highlighting areas of her study that applied to the Scott River Watershed Council, although the SRWC was not included in her study. She answered questions from the Council members in attendance, and will leave a copy of this study and other reference materials in the RCD office for anyone to review further.

OPEN FORUM:

- Jeffy commented on Sari’s presentation with suggestions of more field trips, adding more occasions to eat together, and doing things together.
- Open discussion of Sari’s presentation by everyone present.

OLD BUSINESS:

ROLE OF AGENCIES: By common consent the Council agreed on the following areas discussed:

- Agencies cannot serve on the Executive Committee or Voting Council.
- Be aware of conflict of interest.

GENERAL PROCESS STRUCTURE: The Draft Recommendations of January 4, 2000 were discussed.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE STRUCTURE: Ernie Wilkinson motioned / Mike Bryan seconded: The Technical Committee composed of a nucleus of Dennis Maria and Gary Black as principle participants with further participation to be selected by the Executive Committee for the purpose of ranking proposals based on the format used in the past and to submit ranked proposals to the General Council and the Executive Committee for decision. Approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

DIRECTIVES TO STANDING COMMITTEES:

1. Jeffy, Coordinator and Carolyn, Secretary to contact each committee with Jeffy being principal contact in relaying information to people for committee times, dates, and places.
2. Selection determined for Chair/Representatives to attend next Executive Committee Meeting:

Community Relations – Ric Costales	Education – Gareth Plank
Water – Gary Black	Monitoring – Andrew Eller
Fish & Wildlife – Jennifer Silveira	Land – Ernie Wilkinson
3. Tasks for committees to accomplish by February Council meeting:
 - Formulate committee objectives
 - Start to identify possible project ideas

DETERMINATION OF MEETING SCHEDULES:

1. Full Council – Third Tuesday of each month with February 15th being the next meeting.
2. Executive Committee – Tuesday, February 1, 6:30 p.m. at the RCD office.

SHORT REPORTS:

- Staff – Jeffy submitted a written report covering activities of subwatershed groups, Ranch Water Quality Workshop coming up later in the month and February, committee work, and the second meeting to map limiting factors for salmon and steelhead in the Scott River watershed.
- Gary gave an oral report on the work going on with the three fish screens currently underway and nearly completed with more to come this summer and next winter. He has also been working on final reports for several projects.
- Lorrie gave an oral report on auto cad design work for vertical and incline screens to be built by fabricators. Her focus has been on the eleven screens scheduled for completion in 2000.
- Executive Committee – No report.
- Subwatershed Groups – No report other than what has been reported in Jeffy's staff report.

**SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING: Tuesday February 15, 2000 – 7:00 p.m.
Etna Methodist Church**

- Grad student demonstration of GIS map layers in the Scott River watershed. (15 min.)
- Update on the tailings proposed project.
- By-laws (tentative – to be determined by amount of review work Exec. Committee is able to do.)
- Designation of Representatives from Standing Committees


ADJOURNMENT: It was motioned / seconded / approved to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel, Recording Secretary

No Corrections _____ / Corrections as Indicated by Handwritten Insertions _____

Approved _____ Date _____
Facilitator / Chairperson

Minutes are subject to change/correction when submitted for approval at the next meeting, and do not become official until all appropriate signatures are affixed.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 1999
United Methodist Church, Etna

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order at 7:10 p.m. by Jeffy Davis Marx, Facilitator as no volunteers came forward to chair this meeting.
- Self-introductions – 36 in attendance.
- A list of rules for conduct was read by the Facilitator/Chair and was accepted by common consent of the Council.
- Minutes of November 16, 1999 approved by common consent with the following correction and additions:
 - Scott River Watershed CRMP – November 16, 1999: Correction on page 2, last sentence changed from “Call for the question: 4 thumbs down”, to “3 thumbs down”.
 - Scott River Watershed Council – November 16, 1999: Additions on first page – Add “United Methodist Church” to title, and to second paragraph after “Jeff accepts” add “under Roberts Rules of Order”
- The Agenda was amended by adding to Old Business - B. Review of process as presented to the old CRMP by the Ad Hoc Reorganization Committee, and moving Open Forum after Announcements. Amended agenda approved by common consent.
- The Council accepted by common consent to have Carolyn Pimentel continue to be Recording Secretary for the Scott River Watershed Council Meetings.
- Announcements:
 - Facilitator took this opportunity to give the attending group background on the organization of this new watershed council, and requested two volunteers to write wall notes – Dal Ekland and Jennifer Silveira volunteered.

OPEN FORUM:

- Establishment of voting process was approved by continuing with common consent until any participant has an objection, then proceed with majority vote under Robert’s Rules of Order.
- Use Fish and Wildlife agreement (to fund coordinator).
- Group discussion on pros, cons, and concerns with past CRMP and what should or could be salvaged or adapted to new process. Concerns on possible purpose of the new Watershed Council used as a regulatory review process, and questions on how sub-watershed groups are represented.

OLD BUSINESS:

PRINCIPLES AND GOALS REVIEW - General agreement that principles are concepts the Council agrees to and will abide by that are non-negotiable, and to add the word “voluntary” to the primary focus statement. **Motion – Larry Toelle / Second – Warren Farnum: To accept the entire page as presented in Draft # 3 Scott River Watershed Council Definition of Scott River Watershed Principles and Goals with the amendment additions of adding the word “voluntarily” to the first line under Principles to read – “The primary focus of the Scott River Watershed Council’s efforts will be on *voluntarily* conserving ...”, and changing heading of Goals to *Objectives*. Passed.**

REVIEW OF PROCESS AS PRESENTED BY THE AD HOC REORGANIZATION COMMITTEE TO THE OLD CRMP

General agreement of: the definition of "custom & culture" as defined in the Siskiyou County Comprehensive Land and Resource Management Plan, subwatershed groups participate as individual community members (role of Community Relations Committee is vital to keep public informed of meetings, events, information, etc.), the Executive Committee is the voting body of the Council and always makes decisions in the presence of and with input from the larger public body. **Motion – Larry Toelle / Seconded – Mary Roehrich to: reorganize the flow chart diagram according to Toelle's suggestion to reverse the flow to better show the grassroots driven process. Motion amended by Gareth Plank to accept reorganized flow chart in principle with the exception of the details of the Technical Committee jurisdiction. Motion as amended passed.**

NEW BUSINESS:

SELECTION OF INTERIM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: The following individuals volunteered to serve until Standing Committees select representatives:

Interim Executive Committee

Alan Kramer
Gareth Plank
Bernard Dowling
Ernie Wilkinson
Dave Black

Executive Committee Alternates

Ric Costales
Keith Taylor
Mike Bryan

BY-LAWS MODIFICATION REVIEW: Tabled. Meanwhile, review at home and send written changes/suggestion to RCD office for the Executive Committee. General agreement: to defer the following issues to Executive Committee - review of the by-laws, set agenda for the next meeting, select chair and vice chair for next meeting, and set a deadline by which Standing Committee must select their representatives.

NEW BUSINESS:

STANDING COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION AND FORMATION:

Community Relations

Mary Roehrich
Carolyn Pimentel
Ric Costales
Bernard Dowling

Education

Gareth Plank
Bernard Dowling
Ric Costales
Andrew Eller
Keith Taylor
Wing Hodas

Water

Gary Black
Warren Farnam
Mike Bryan
Bruce Bradford
Wing Hodas
Jeff Fowle
Lorrie Bundy
Jay Power

Monitoring

Carl Schwarzenberg
Jennifer Silveira
Gary Black
Lorrie Bundy
Dennis Maria
Andrew Eller

Fish & Wildlife

Gary Black
Jim Kilgore
Jennifer Silveira
Dennis Maria

Land Use

Alan Kramer
Tom Shorey
Warren Farnam
Gareth Plank
Kyle Haines
Mary Roehrich
Bruce Bradford
Doug Blangsted
Keith Taylor

SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING:

- Invite Sari Sommarstrom to speak on her group structure study principles that would be relevant to this Council.
- Technical Committee Jurisdiction
- General Process Structure
- Designation of Representatives from Standing Committees


ADJOURNMENT: By Facilitator/Chair at 9:30 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel, Recording Secretary

No Corrections _____ / Corrections as Indicated by Handwritten Insertions _____

Approved _____ Date _____
Facilitator / Chairperson

Minutes are subject to change/correction when submitted for approval at the next meeting, and do not become official until all appropriate signatures are affixed.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

MINUTES

NOVEMBER 16, 1999

Etna United Methodist Church

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called to order and introductions made by Wing Hodas, Chairman, 7:10 p.m.
- Member Organizations in Attendance (currently 7 voting members with 2 absent from this meeting):

C.D. Fish & Game - 0	Siskiyou R.C.D. - 1 vote
Cattlemen's Association - 0	Small Landowners At-Large - 1 & 1 votes
Klamath Forest Alliance - 1 vote	Large Timberland Owners - 0
Farm Bureau - 0	Non-Industrial Timber Owners - 1 vote
Audubon Society - 0	Siskiyou County - 0
Scott Valley Hay Growers - 1	
Scott Valley Irrigation District - 1	
- Advisors in Attendance: 3
- Staff in Attendance: 5
- Guests & Visitors in Attendance: 12
- Rules for conduct read by Jeffy Davis Marx, CRMP Coordinator.
- Minutes of October 19, 1999 were accepted as mailed.
- Agenda was not adjusted and accepted as published.
- Announcements: There will be a Community Mapping process meeting in Fort Jones at the Community Center on Thursday November 18, 1999 at 7:00 p.m. The public is invited.

OLD BUSINESS

AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Ad Hoc Reorganization Committee consisting of Wing Hodas, Ric Costales, Ernie Wilkinson, and Dennis Maria reported having met several times to work on their charge. Ernie read a prepared statement commenting on the committee's tasks and goals. He then reviewed the Draft Recommendations for Restructuring of Scott River Watershed CRMP Council that was mailed out with the agenda for this meeting and available at the meeting. The other Committee members (Dennis Maria was absent) offered the following comments of clarification: Referring to Freda's recommendations, the CRMP is suffering from a lack of community support, but is seeking to recover. Bi-monthly educational meetings are recommended although not specifically listed in the Draft Recommendations for Restructuring. The Ad Hoc Committee answered other questions of clarification.

Discussion of questions and concerns:

- Do committee representatives on the Executive Committee vote for themselves or committee?
- Issues to consider:
 - Subwatershed groups - how will their interest be addressed?
 - Is there any limit to committee sizes?

- Should agencies select/nominate folks for Technical Committee (Fish & Game already a leading force).
- Some issues not spelled out in this plan – i.e. RCD/CRMP Relationship.
- Keep it simple.
- Technical Committee needs to go beyond “ologists” and include project coordinator, etc.
- Technical Committee rates projects on-the-ground using form.
- Subwatershed groups can participate in committees.
- Outreach process on committees –
 - Community Relations Committee.
 - Resource issues need to be discussed with the community in mind.
- Can you be a council member and not be a committee member?
- Inter-Agency Advisory – help with permitting ease – could be appointed by agencies.
- Voting – 5 members present and all must vote “yes” for approval of issue or motion. Standing aside?
- Upland Committee – why? If no Agricultural Committee, there could be issues that may not get covered in other committees.
- Are committees given a blank slate?
- Purpose of watershed council?
- Alleviate defensive posture by agricultural community.
- What about committees being dominated by interests? Lopsided? Balanced?
- Active participation will best assure balanced committees.
- Primary function is to conceive of and propose projects.
- Concerns:
 - Economic interests of the community not addressed in the process.
 - Committees will address this issue as long as participants do.
- Ideas:
 - Upland could be called Land Use.
 - Focus energy of Council on community vitality.
 - Community outreach and education may dovetail.
 - Make committees regional rather than fish, water, etc.
 - Need a way to kill process if it does not work.
 - CRMP Handbook states goals are to protect improve and maintain natural resources.

Chairman closes discussion.

Motion / seconded: To adopt in concept the Draft Recommendations for Restructuring of Scott River Watershed CRMP Council as presented. Discussion. Call for the question: 4 thumbs up / 1 thumb down – motion fails.


Discussion surrounded the KFA reasons for their thumbs down vote and length of time needed to resolve issues unacceptable to them for restructuring the CRMP. KFA stated that the Recommendations are a good start at restructuring, but they need more clarification and more specific language incorporated into the recommendations to be acceptable to them."

Motion / seconded: To continue the CRMP in existing form. Discussion. Call for the question: 4 thumbs down / 1 thumb up: motion fails – CRMP does not exist. Meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman at 9:15 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel
CRMP Program Manager

Approved _____ Date _____



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

MINUTES

OCTOBER 19, 1999

Fort Jones Community Center

At 7:02 Jeffy Davis Marx announced that the Chairman, Alan Kramer would be late and suggested that the video "Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems" be shown. Those in attendance agreed, and the video was shown from 7:05 to 7:35 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order and introductions made by Alan Kramer, Chairman, 7:40 p.m.
- Member Organizations in Attendance:

C.D. Fish & Game – 1	Siskiyou R.C.D. – 1
Klamath Forest Alliance - 1	Small Landowners At-Large (3 & 1 alt.) - 2 & 1
Audubon Society – 0	Large Timberland Owners - 0
Scott Valley Hay Growers - 0	Non-Industrial Timber Owners – 1 & 1 alt.
Scott Valley Irrigation District – 0	Siskiyou County - 1
- Advisors in Attendance: 3
- Staff in Attendance: 4
- Guests & Visitors in Attendance: 6
- Rules for conduct read by Jeffy Davis Marx, CRMP Coordinator.
- Minutes of September 21, 1999 were accepted as mailed.
- Adjusted agenda was approved by adding to Old Business "Ray Haupt, USFS Scott River Ranger Dist. letter effecting next month Chairmanship", and by tabling "Water Users Group" under New Business as Mary Roehrich is not able to attend this meeting.
- Announcements: Jeffy showed the award plaque that was presented to the CRMP and will be displayed at the Siskiyou RCD office – "Nathaniel Bingham Memorial Award Presented to Scott River Watershed CRMP for Supporting Anadromous Fisheries Restoration, Klamath River Watershed 1999 Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force". Congratulations CRMP! Sue Maurer was also awarded the Nathaniel Bingham Memorial Award to an Individual for Supporting Anadromous Fisheries Restoration.
Congratulations Sue!

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

FISH – Meetings have discussed how to develop proposals, looking for funds to assess out-migrant, and the committee has lost 2 members that need to be replaced.

UPLAND – Has not met and has nothing to report except that a meeting needs to be scheduled after hunting season for on-the-ground ideas.

MONITORING – Andrew Eller met in September for pre-site rockwork for the Whipple project using the new and improved monitoring form, and at the JH Ranch as well. Committee is organizing a tool bag for field monitoring, and has discussed large scale monitoring ideas.

AG – No committee members present

WATER – No report. Ken Maurer offered his observation that gauging station information is available on the internet, and that water looks low at Highway 3 bridge, but comes back up. Water is going underground and coming back. Ernie Wilkinson offered that upslope trees losing their leaves after hard frost will produce more flow from trees no longer needing water, and there is more flow in French Creek and there is still snow in upper elevations.

PLAN – No report.

CRMP/SRCD Relationship – Waiting for SRCD to respond back to CRMP on the 10/19/99 Draft Relationship Agreement.

TECH – No report.

AD HOC REORGANIZATION – Have met twice and will meet again to have an outline prepared for the CRMP to review by the next regular CRMP meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

RAY HAUPT, USFS SCOTT RIVER RANGER DIST. LETTER AFFECTING NEXT MONTH

CHAIRMANSHIP: The USFS letter by Ray Haupt, District Ranger that changed the status of the USFS membership from voting to advisory only was read to the Council at a previous meeting and passed around for review at this meeting as requested by Council members. The change in membership status affects Jim Kilgore, USFS as the next scheduled meeting chairman. Alan Kramer volunteered to chair the next meeting if Wing Hodas cannot.

STREAM CARE GUIDE: Jeffy informed the Council that it will cost between \$1,400 to customize the example stream care guide to the Scott River watershed and print it, and that there is CRMP funding earmarked for education that could be used for a portion of the cost. Dennis Maria volunteered to bring the issue of a cost share to the Siskiyou County Fish & Game Commission. Randy Seelbrede, NRCS suggested that funds in the amount of \$500 to \$1,000 could be available through EQIP. **The Council reached consensus for Jeffy to write and sent a request letter to NRCS and County Fish and Game Commission for \$500 to \$1,000 funding each.**

FALL FLOWS ACTION PLAN – 1999-2000 PROPOSED ACTIONS: KFA distributed a handout for suggested Fall Flows potential actions as derived from the plan's objectives. The Water Committee submitted a 3-point list of actions in July. After discussion Gary and Lorrie will gather information on what has already been done in the area of water efficiency. **The Council reached consensus to refer the issue back to the Water Committee and staff to develop a combination of all recommendations to be brought back to the full Council for consideration.**

PROPOSALS: PUBLIC OUTREACH & PROJECT DEVELOPMENT: The handout titled "DRAFT, August 17, 1999 Scott River Watershed Council (CRMP) Annual Process for Project Development" was distributed to the Council for review and discussion. **The Council reached consensus to have the staff use this draft as a starting point for a re-write including an opportunity process for a quick turn around on short timeframe deadlines, for committees to be more involved in project development, and to bring the re-write back to the full Council for review and approval.**

GRAVEL MINE ISSUE: Educational discussion. No action.

NEW BUSINESS:

WATER USERS GROUP: Tabled until Mary Roehrich can be in attendance.

CDF PROJECT ENDORSEMENT – ETNA SHADED FUEL BREAK: Discussion. **The Council reached consensus to send a letter of support for the maintenance of the Etna Fuel Break to CDF.**

CRMP COORDINATOR REPORT: Jeffy distributed a written report covering the following: The Task Force honored Sue Maurer with the Nat Bingham individual award and Scott River CRMP with the organizational award. Subwatershed group activity with Shackleford/Mill and Tailing Landowners. Workshop idea priorities, and 1603 meetings. Project activity with Abner Weed selected by RCD as Watershed Ed. Coordinator. Anyone interested in volunteering to participate in the Humboldt State Univ. GIS/planning project for a community mapping process contact Jeffy. Letters of resignation from CRMP

membership have been received from the Siskiyou County Farm Bureau and the Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association.

PROJECT COORDINATOR REPORTS:

Lorrie – Distributed a written report covering Fish Screens with NMFS agreed to local review by CDFG using NMFS criteria, site surveys, field prep work, fabrication on two screens to start soon, and design work; Temperature Monitoring units will be left in place as long as possible and removed when flows come up; Water Balance final report provided to Jim DePree of Siskiyou Co. for data search for groundwater plan; KRIS updated by Pat Higgins and showcased to staff, and office computers are now networked to provide easier data transfers and backup.

Gary – Reported that in-stream work done during the last month on three projects is almost completed. Road implementation site reviews have been done by landowner and agencies and all are satisfied. Gary reported that Warren has been working on stockwater systems.

Danielle – AmeriCorps Report – working on EUHSD Watershed Education project.

MEMBER REPORTS:

KFA – Offered handouts on several topics, and announced that KFA has petitioned the Board of Forestry on impaired watersheds.

Sis. Co. – The County is looking for a bridge deck that was removed from Kennedy property. Public can come watch the bridge being set at the Masterson Creek site on Oct. 27th in the a.m.

CDFG – Distributed a handout on Governor Davis Signs Historic Water Bond Legislation For March 2000 Ballot.

ADVISORY REPORTS:

USFWS – Commented on USFS position on the CRMP with USFWS receiving similar instruction from legal counsel in response to a lawsuit at the national level.

NRCS – Ranch Water Quality Planing sessions are scheduled for Shasta Valley on November 29th, December 6th, and January 13th. January and February will be in Scott Valley.

OPEN FORUM: Ric Costales commented on the KFA concept to free small landowners from large landowner regulations. Gary Black questioned definition of “large” and “small” landowners.

SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS -

- Subbasin Planning
- Implementation of Upslope Projects Report
- Temperature
- Water Users Group
- CRMP/SRCD Relationship Agreement
- Stream Care Guide
- Fall Flows Action Plan 1999-2000 Proposed Actions Re-Write
- Proposals: Public Outreach & Project Development Re-Write
- BIN: Kidder Diaries – history of watershed (agenda item in 6 or so months)


ADJOURNMENT: Chairman at 10:05 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel

CRMP Program Manager

No Corrections _____ Corrections as indicated by handwritten insertions _____

Approved _____ Date _____



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 22, 1999

Etna United Methodist Church

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order and introductions made by Felice Pace, Chairman, 7:10 p.m.
- Member Organizations in Attendance:
 - C.D. Fish & Game – 1
 - Cattlemen's Association – 0
 - Klamath Forest Alliance – 1 & 1
 - Farm Bureau – 0
 - Marble Mt. Audubon Society – 0
 - Scott Valley Hay Growers – 0
 - Scott Valley Irrigation District – 0
 - Siskiyou R.C.D. – 1
 - Small Landowners At-Large (3 & 1 alt.) – 2 & 1
 - Large Timberland Owners – 0
 - U.S. Forest Service (1 & 2 alts.) – 0 & 0
 - Non-Industrial Timber Owners – 1
 - Siskiyou County – 0
- Advisors in Attendance: 0
- Staff in Attendance: 5
- Guests & Visitors in Attendance: 4
- Guidelines for conduct read by Jeffy Davis Marx, CRMP Coordinator.
- Minutes of August 17, 1999 were accepted as mailed.
- Agenda was approved and accepted as mailed with notation to add gravel mine issue to October agenda.
- Announcements:
 - Introduction of and welcome to Danielle Quigley, the new AmeriCorps volunteer.
 - Jeffy is going to be a grandmother, and Gary is going to be dad to baby number two!
 - Meredith Bird Rescue Benefit Pot Luck on Oct. 16th at Greenvine Grange needs silent auction items.

SHORT REPORTS:

STAFF –

- **Jeffy** distributed a written report covering activities with Shackleford/Mill and The Tailings Subwatershed Groups, workshop ideas for the fall of 1999, JITW proposals of Water Temperature Monitoring and Scott River Geomorphic Analysis that were submitted, attendance at the Sept. 1st Watershed Mgt. Council forum in Davis, Calif., the "under construction" CRMP webpage, announced that the Orel Lewis interview video is available to check out, and report work on the Irrigation Mgt. Practices project.
- **Gary** continues to exercise the paper reduction act by delivering an oral report on in-stream work that is starting with Mark Johnson as contractor, Shackleford/Mill Road Erosion Inventory final report that is phasing into the road improvement work that will be mostly on Shackleford Creek, and meeting with landowners on project possibilities for future on-the-ground work.
- **Warren** reported on work he's done on landowner proposals, developing a prototype fish protection barrier for water diversion as an alternative to fish screen on the Kidder Ditch, work on stockwater system design, and a pipeline project idea for a Patterson Creek ditch.
- **Lorrie** submitted a written report on fish screen designs that have been approved by CDFG on Boulder Creek, the design for a screen will review another design for lower Sugar Creek by end of September, surveying and biological evaluations will be completed by Oct. 15th, temperature monitoring work, water balance Phase I has been completed and final report submitted to the UC SAREP funder, submitted

temperature monitoring proposal for JITW funding, and worked on proposal development for Water Committee recommendation to pipe ditches.

ADVISORY REPORTS – None

MEMBER REPORTS –

- **CDFG** Dennis Maria reported that monitoring showed increased coho counts in the French Creek drainage with most marked increases in Miner's Creek in a stretch where the landowner has allowed woody debris to remain in the stream. An at-large CRMP member suggested this information be placed on the CRMP website.
- **Non-Industrial Timber Alternate** Ric Costales reported on the Board of Forestry hearing meeting in Sacramento on implementing the 300' critical habitat on timberland stream corridors.
- **Small Landowner – At Large** Dan Petit requested a temporary leave of absence from CRMP participation due to health problem and is actively looking for an alternate.
- **Small Landowner – At Large** Wing Hodas reported that Tozier cattle are crossing the river again. Riparian planting on the Hodas property has been browsed heavily by deer, but what has survived is doing very well.
- **KFA** Felice Pace reported that he attended the Board of Forestry meeting.

FREDA'S RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SPECIAL MEETING PROCESS – Discussion

FACILITAION TRAINING FOR CRMP MEMBERS – Discussion

PARTICIPATION – The Council reached consensus to create a short-term committee to deal with Attendance status, New Committee for Outreach, and Meeting Reorganization. The following volunteered to serve on the committee: Ernie Wilkinson, Chair, Dennis Maria, Wing Hodas, Ric Costales, and Jeffy as facilitator. This committee agreed to meet on Monday September 27th in Fort Jones at 7:00 p.m.

BYLAWS AMENDMENT: CHRONIC MEETING BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS/CONSEQUENCES – No consensus reached.

SRCD/CRMP RELATIONSHIP GUIDELINES – Consensus was reached to send the Felice Pace draft with changes by Gary Black to the RCD Board for their consideration.

OTHER ACTIONS ON RECOMMENDATIONS – Each of Freda's recommendations was considered and discussed with the following list deferred to the newly formed Adhoc Recommendations Committee: participation; meeting reorganization – how often, format, etc.; roles of committees

Some of the brainstormed ideas on changes in CRMP were: Need cross-section of interests in memberships; need more landowner participation in projects; more subcommittee work to develop project ideas; fewer CRMP Council meetings; committees to develop project ideas; CRMP can no longer provide safety net, security, no longer our role; CRMP is about education; CRMP membership can be in flux to reflect the interests and times; disagreement with facilitator's given: Member organization can send any rep they want; CRMP training in consensus process; everyone bring two project ideas they want to work on; annual retreat/evaluation including revision of 5-Year Plan; limiting discussion.

STREAM CARE GUIDE - Tabled

FALL FLOWS ACTION PAN – 1999-2000 PROPOSED ACTIONS – "Fall Flows Action Plan: Potential FY 2001 Actions to Increase Fall Flows with Shackleford-Mill Emphasis" was handed out for consideration at the next meeting.

PROPOSALS: PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT – Tabled

GROUNDWATER PLAN LETTER TO COUNTY – The Council reached consensus to approve the letter and send it with the following changes: In the last paragraph, second line, add the words "helping to" and change "restoring" to "restore" for the line to read – "...undertaken if we are to succeed in helping to restore salmon and steelhead..."

WORKSHOPS – The Council reached consensus to sponsor the CDFG 1600 permitting educational workshops to be held in Etna and Fort Jones on October 7th & 8th. Priority of other workshops resulted in the following order: CDFG 1603 informational meetings, training for landowners in project development, water flow measurement and adjudication information for landowners, panel discussion of new Board of Forestry rules package for water protection. It was suggested to send Andrew Eller to the riparian expert, June Davis, rather than inviting her here.

PROPOSAL FOR A WATER USER GROUP – Tabled

RESPONSE TO PIONEER PRESS – Tabled

COMMITTEE REPORTS - Tabled

OPEN FORUM: None


SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS – October 19, 1999 – Fort Jones

- All items tabled from September 21st meeting
- Water User's Group Video
- November – Sari Sommarstrom – Watershed Council Study Results

ADJOURNMENT: Acting Chair at 10:12 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel
CRMP Program Manager

Approved _____ Date _____



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

MINUTES

DRAFT

JULY 20, 1999

Etna United Methodist Church

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called to order and introductions made by Wing Hodas, Chairman, 7:02 p.m.
- Member Organizations in Attendance:

C.D. Fish & Game - 1	Siskiyou R.C.D. - 1
Cattlemen's Association - 0	Small Landowners At-Large (3 & 1 alt.) - 0 & 1
Klamath Forest Alliance - 2	Large Timberland Owners - 0
Farm Bureau - 0	U.S. Forest Service (1 & 2 alts.) - 0 & 1
Marble Mt. Audubon Society - 0	Non-Industrial Timber Owners - 1
Scott Valley Hay Growers - 0	Siskiyou County - 1
Scott Valley Irrigation District - 1	
- Advisors in Attendance: 1
- Staff in Attendance: 4 Guests & Visitors in Attendance: 2
- Rules for conduct read by Jeffy Davis Marx, CRMP Coordinator.
- Minutes of June 15, 1999 were accepted with the following correction: Under Member Reports, the last line corrected by deleting the word "*opposing*" and inserting "*concerned about activity on...*".
- Agenda was adjusted and accepted by adding, "*French Creek Home Owner's Letter*" to New Business.
- Announcements:
 - Carol Wilson was introduced as the new KFA Executive Director.
 - Carlin Finke, U.C. Humboldt grad student was introduced.
 - CDFG has a new field biologist, Doug Killen^{CM} for Siskiyou County.
 - Siskiyou Co. is staying on schedule for work on the bridge. The next work project will be on Masterson Creek Road.
 - Wing suggested exclusion fencing on Quartz Valley Road near Scott River Road be an issue for discussion at a future meeting.
 - Jeffy read the letter by District Ranger, Ray Haupt that was presented to the CRMP at a previous meeting by Jay Power for CRMP member information.
 - Ric Costales complemented Jeffy on her excellent article in the Pioneer Press.
 - Carolyn Pimentel attended a noxious weed field identification tour sponsored by the Siskiyou Co. Ag Commissioner, and obtained an office copy of Selected Noxious Weeds of Northeastern California - A Field Identification Guide.

SHORT REPORTS:

STAFF REPORTS:

Lorrie - submitted a written report covering fish screen progress, temperature monitoring work, submitted a progress report to CDFG on the Water Balance, and CRMP committee work.

Garv - reported on the Fish and Game permitting for three projects and design work which is going smoothly; he is also mulching spring plantings with bark and installing protection from deer browse.

Jeffy - submitted a written report covering activity with South Fork, Shackleford/Mill and Tailings Subwatershed Groups, and ideas for workshops for the fall. She presented a draft Description of

CRMP Minutes of July 20, 1999

and a fish screen. The Council reached consensus to have both projects submitted to the Tech Committee for ranking before the next meeting.

TASK FORCE LANDOWNER RECOGNITION: Submit suggested individuals and/or groups at the next meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

WATER – Submitted a written report (copied on back of Jeffy's report) consisting of suggested proposal ideas of creating a water trust, waterusers measure own use, implement a demonstration project.

FISH - None

AG - None

UPLAND – Had a meeting last week and scheduled a field trip for July 19th that was canceled for a number of reasons. Proposal base line – sites on Plank and Merlow ranches for type conversion with access to old photos to make comparisons with identifiable locations.

PLAN - None

MONITORING – *Andrew Eller* is the Chair. The next meeting will be a field trip in mid August. They are still testing processes on project completion.

CRMP/RCD RELATIONSHIP – As the former members of this committee are no longer active members and no one else volunteered, any member who sees a problem with the draft Description of the RCD/CRMP Relationship should join the CRMP/RCD Relationship Committee. The Description will be mailed out.

OPEN FORUM:

- Alan Kramer suggested with the cost of mailings that anyone with e-mail have information transmitted that way. An e-mail sign up list was circulated.
- Ric Costales suggested a need for a committee to address community outreach for understanding.
- Carol *Wilson*, KFA objected to the Ray Haupt letter being read to the Council. Requested CRMP Council attendance record for the last year. *no project service*
- Jeffy attended a meeting with Jim Nelson, CDFG, Siskiyou RCD staff and two RCD board members to discuss ideas for landowner issues and solutions related to the new 1603 permitting process. Landowner meetings will be scheduled for information exchanges later this season with the Fish & Game.


SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS – AUGUST 17, 1999 – FORT JONES someplace!

- Speaker – Jim DuPree
- By-Laws Amendment for Representative or Organization Dismissal from CRMP Membership
- By-Laws Amendment for Chronic Meeting Behavior Problems
- Establish Membership in Accordance with the By-Laws
- Freda's Recommendations for Conflict Resolution
- Siskiyou RCD/Scott River CRMP Relationship: Committee Members / Guidelines
- Fall Flows Action Plan 1999-2000 Proposed Action
- Proposal Rating Process
- Stream Care Guide
- Facilitation Training for CRMP Members
- French Creek Homeowner Concerns
- Tech Committee Ranking of JITW Proposals
- Task Force Landowner Recognition Recommendations
- Creation of a new committee for Community Outreach

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Hodas at 9:55 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel, CRMP Program Manager
Approved _____

No Corrections _____ Corrections as indicated _____
Date _____



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

MINUTES

AUGUST 17, 1999

Fort Jones Community Center

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order and introductions made by Wing Hodas, Chairman at 7:05 p.m.
- Member Organizations in Attendance:
 - C.D. Fish & Game - 2
 - Cattlemen's Association - 0
 - Klamath Forest Alliance - 2
 - Farm Bureau - 0
 - Audubon Society - 0
 - Scott Valley Hay Growers - 0
 - Scott Valley Irrigation District - 0
 - Siskiyou R.C.D. - 0
 - Small Landowners At-Large (3 & 1 alt.) - 0 & 1
 - Large Timberland Owners - 0
 - U.S. Forest Service (1 & 2 alts.) - 0 & 2
 - Non-Industrial Timber Owners - 2
 - Siskiyou County - 2
- Advisors in Attendance: 2
- Staff in Attendance: 5
- Guests & Visitors in Attendance: 10
- Guidelines for conduct read by Jeffy Davis Marx, CRMP Coordinator.
- Minutes of July 20, 1999 were accepted and approved by motion and second with the following corrections:
 - First page - Wilson corrected to Wright, Killen corrected to Killam. 6th bullet - add USFS before District Ranger.
 - Third page - Under MONITORING change "Lorrie" to "Andrew Eller", correct Wilson to Wright, add USFS after Ray Haupt.
- Agenda was adjusted and approved by adding to Old Business, J-French Creek Letter, and moving Open Forum from item VII to III:
- Announcements:
 - Don Howell - County roadwork closures and conditions, and Cal-Fed meeting schedule.
 - Gary/Carolyn - Planning Department has been requested by RCD to correct its mailing list for use permit review from CRMP to Siskiyou RCD.
 - Jeffy - Ernie Wilkinson is recovering from aneurysm surgery at Fairchild Medical Center.
 - Jeffy - AmeriCorps volunteer selection has been made.
 - Felice - Biological Opinion on Klamath resulted in increased flow in Klamath. Available through NMFS.
 - Wing observed muddy water running in Moffett. Ric Costales and Don Howell clarified that the source of the turbidity is coming from Duzel.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM: Jim De Pree, Siskiyou County Natural Resource Specialist spoke on the county groundwater plan process. The Siskiyou Board of Supervisors approved The Siskiyou County Groundwater Ordinance, and a Groundwater Management Plan is next in the process. The goals of a groundwater protection plan have been identified for the purpose of protecting water resources of Siskiyou County. The two main issues concerning existing data are the need for more information from local residents, and the need for Siskiyou County citizens to get involved in the process so that the desires of the citizens can be incorporated into the plan. The planning process has not begun; it is in a study phase now

AUDUBON REPRESENTATION: Tabled

CRMP MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION: 1. attendance status, 2. new committee for outreach, and 3. meeting reorganization: Tabled

LETTER FROM FRENCH CREEK LANDOWNERS: Discussion of a letter of concerns about the Jack logging sale from the French Creek Property Owners resulted in the Council giving direction to Jeffy to encourage the property owners to get together with the French Creek Watershed Advisory Group, and for Jeffy to report back to the Council on results.

SHORT REPORTS:

PROJECT COORDINATORS:

Gary – Working on RCD bank stabilization and riparian planting projects for this fall with permitting, field visits, and designing. CDFG contract administration has changed from Carl Harral to Phil Warner, Ron Dotson and Dennis Maria. Up-slope Shackleford/Mill project inventory has been completed and moving toward the implementation phase of the next project.

Lorrie – Submitted a written report covering work and activity on fish screens, temperature monitoring, the water balance, and CRMP committee work.

Warren – Reported that the only thing he was able to do was have emergency appendix surgery. (Rough health month!)

CRMP COORDINATOR – Jeffy submitted a written report covering announcements of Ernie Wilkinson's surgery, and the new AmeriCorps volunteer. She also reported on work and activity with sub-watershed groups, workshop ideas (council is to choose 2 or 3 from the list she provided in her written report), Job-In-The-Woods proposals, subbasin planning, and outreach. She also reported on attending and speaking at a Congressional Tour in Klamath Falls for the purpose of informing representatives' aides on issues and needs in the Klamath Basin.

MEMBER:

KFA – Felice attended a Congressional Fact-Finding Tour in Klamath Falls. Handed out a written issue summary on water quality and salmon.

Non-Industrial Timber – New Proposed Rules for Forest Practices are out. Alan announced that Dan Larivee is stepping down and has appointed Ric Costales to take his place as CRMP member.

Siskiyou County – Don Howell announced the March 1999 Fish Passage at Road Culverts Design is out, and he will be absent for the next CRMP meeting so he can attend the 5-County Plan meeting.

ADVISORY: None

SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS – for SEPTEMBER 21, 1999:

- Sari Sommarstrom – watershed council study results
- Tabled items


ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Hodas at 10:00 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel
CRMP Program Manager

No corrections, changes or additions _____

Corrections, changes, additions as indicated by handwritten insertions _____

Approved _____ Date _____



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

MINUTES

JUNE 15, 1999

Fort Jones Elementary School, Fort Jones, California

CALL TO ORDER:

- Meeting called order and introductions made by Mike Bryan, Chairman, and Wing Hodas, Vice Chair at 7:00 p.m. Jeffy introduced Warren Farnam, an additional Siskiyou RCD Project Coordinator. Larry Alexander, NorCET was also introduced.
- Member Organizations in Attendance:

C.D. Fish & Game - 1	Siskiyou R.C.D. - 1
Cattlemen's Association - 0	Small Landowners At-Large (3 & 1 alt.) - 1 & 0
Klamath Forest Alliance - 2	Large Timberland Owners - 0
Farm Bureau - 0	U.S. Forest Service (1 & 2 alts.) - 0 & 1
Marble Mt. Audubon Society - 1	Non-Industrial Timber Owners - 1
Scott Valley Hay Growers - 0	Siskiyou County - 1
Scott Valley Irrigation District - 1	
- Advisors in Attendance: 2
- Staff in Attendance: 5
- Guests & Visitors in Attendance: 5
- Rules for conduct read by Jeffy Davis Marx, CRMP Coordinator.
- Minutes of May 18, 1999 were accepted and approved with the following corrections: Page 1 - Change Small Landowner At-Large in attendance from 0 & 1 to 1 & 1. Page 3 - Insert as follows in second bullet under SHORT REPORTS to read - "...and doing documentation preparation on historic records for Scott River based on the South Fork of the Trinity...". Page 3 - correct typo in third bullet under COMMITTEE REPORTS to read - "All other committees had no report."
- Minutes of June 2, 1999 were accepted and approved with the following correction: Page 2 - Strike Etna Methodist Church and replace with "Fort Jones Elementary School."
- Agenda was adjusted in the following manner and approved: Add to COMMITTEE REPORTS: G. Fish, H. Staff Reports (moved from A. of SHORT REPORTS). Add to SHORT REPORTS: Open Forum.
- Announcements:
 - Wing Hodas volunteered to fill the vacancies of Vice Chair for July and Chair for August on the Calendar for CRMP Chair Duty
 - Lorrie announced openings for Fri, Sat. and Sun. at a Bioassessment Training put on by the River Center in Dunsmuir, and has information if anyone is interested in attending. Admission is free and CRMP will pay mileage.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM: South Fork Road Inventory Report - Larry Alexander

Larry clarified NorCET and USFS involvement and cooperation in the South Fork Road Inventory project. The USFS received funding to do inventory work and development of a protocol for several sites in the Klamath National Forest including the South Fork of the Scott. NorCET volunteered to coordinate the South Fork protocol development and inventory in order to maintain consistency across the land ownerships. The protocol developed by the Timber Products and Fruit Growers Supply Co, as well as the data gathered as a result of the inventory, is being integrated with that developed by the Klamath National Forest. He answered

questions regarding hand out copies of two protocols for road inventories and stated that Timber Products and Fruit Growers Supply Co. have not yet decided which protocol they will use but that either way the information obtained will be consistent.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

SRCD/CRMP RELATIONSHIP: Members of the committee are absent and cannot report.

WATER: None

FISH: Felice Pace donated his photos to be added to the photos taken at the Fish Faire.

AG: None

UPLAND: None

PLAN: None

MONITORING: Lorrie reported that they are testing the plan in the field for a pre-project assessment. Some changes are needed. The process will be presented to the CRMP in a future meeting. Andrew Eller is the Chair of the committee and will rotate. More volunteers are needed. Next meeting will be sometime in July.

STAFF REPORTS:

Gary – Putting bark around plantings to protect from heat. Plantings are looking good.

Doing permitting for FG projects, but funding has been held up due to a State 3 million-dollar budget short fall.

Lorrie – Submitted a written report covering fish screens, temperature monitoring, and proposals.

OPEN FORUM: As of June 30, 1999 Marble Mountain Audubon will have dissolved. Consideration of another chapter of Audubon representation (if any) will need to be on the agenda for the next meeting.

CRMP COORDINATOR REPORT: Jeffy submitted a written report covering subwatershed group activity, workshops, SRCD/CRMP Relationship work, proposals, and subbasin planning.

STRATEGY FOR MAINTAINING CIVIL BEHAVIOR: A handout "Maintaining Civil Behavior: Four Level Procedure" was given to the Council to review for consideration of addition to the By-Laws to be determined at the next meeting.

BY-LAWS: Alan Kramer motioned and Felice Pace seconded to approve entire By-Laws document without numbers 4. Dismissal of representative in question, & 5. Dismissal of group in question, under Article XI – Conflict Resolution. Passed without objection.

FALL FLOWS ACTION PLAN: Felice Pace motioned and Alan Kramer seconded to ask Water Committee to come to the full Council ASAP on what action to implement work on in 99/2000 to increase fall flows, and for members and others interested to submit suggestions and/or comments in writing. Passed without objection.

PROPOSALS:

1. Strategy Options – Handout, no discussion necessary. These are options available to CRMP.
2. Rating Process – Hold off.
3. Public Outreach – Ideas exchanged: Fall Educational Workshop, Project Development, Committee Outreach.

RANCH & WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLANNING COURSES – status report

Two sessions occurred, one in the fall of 1998 and one in the spring of 1999. Plans are being made to do this program again this fall. Materials are available by contacting Jeffy or the SRCD office.

LETTER TO COUNTY REQUESTING GROUNDWATER PLAN: Draft letter handed out to Council. Jim DuPree will be reporting to the CRMP in July. Hold letter until after Mr. DuPree's report.

AMERICORPS STEWARD PROGRAM: The Council reached consensus for continuing with another AmeriCorps steward costing approximately \$600 to \$900 for work to be focused on education only.

CRMP/SRCD WEBPAGE: Ideas

Meeting dates, calendar events, watershed & council information and history, projects, facts, figures, plans, mission statement, objectives, accomplishments, members, staff, board of directors, volunteer registration, link

to KRIS, processes, by-laws, separate icons, pages linked, committee information, on-going projects / project status, funder links, way to donate money, fish life cycles, interesting for kids, stream care guide.

STREAM CARE GUIDE: Jeffy was instructed by the Council to investigate adapting the Trinity County Stream Care Guide, to see if Shasta River would like to be involved, and find out the cost of production.

JITW PROJECT POSSIBILITIES: Tabled

FACILITATION TRAINING FOR CRMP MEMBERS: Council instructed Jeffy to investigate who could be obtained as an instructor and costs.

CRMP MEETINGS & INCORPORATION OF EDUCATION: The Council reached consensus for returning to original schedule of incorporating an educational segment at each Council meeting.

MEMBER REPORTS:

- ◆ KFA reported that they have intervening status in a lawsuit initiated by California Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farm Bureau Federation to overturn the TMDL on the Garcia River. KFA has filed a 60-day notice of intent to sue on failure to consult on coho for the Klamath Irrigation Project.
- KFA is opposing the Lover's Camp / Cub Timber sale.

ADVISORY REPORTS:

- ◆ CDF logging season has started in Noyes Valley. Timber Products is upgrading the roads. CFIP is involved in a cost share program for thinning and tree planting for erosion control. Joel Segal is leaving CDF to start a business called Break Time in Yreka

SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS – for Next Regular Meeting:

- ◆ Jim DuPree County Groundwater Ordinance Report
- ◆ Groundwater Plan Letter to County
- ◆ Review Freda's recommendations
- ◆ SRCD/CRMP Guidelines
- ◆ Strategic Plan for Maintaining Civil Behavior
- ◆ Audubon Representation
- ◆ Fall Flows Action Plan – written recommendations
- ◆ Proposal Rating Process
- ◆ Public outreach in proposal development
- ◆ CRMP/SRCD Webpage – ideas and costs
- ◆ Report on Stream Care Guide Possibilities
- ◆ JITW Project Possibilities
- ◆ Facilitation Training for CRMP Members

ADJOURNMENT: by Chairman at 10:00 p.m.

Carolyn Pimentel
CRMP Program Manager

Approved _____ Date _____
Acting Chair or Vice Chair

Standing Committee Reports to Scott River Watershed Council on June 20, 2000

**Community Relations Committee
5-15-00 Meeting Report to Scott River Watershed Council**

Present: Ric Costales, Mary Roehrich, Larry Toelle, Carolyn Pimentel, Jeffy Davis Marx, Marcia Armstrong

- ♦ **Federal Nexus issue as deterrent to confidence in the Council and RCD process;** Land Committee thinks that real examples the nexus being a problem for landowners should be brought to light and then discuss the strategy for avoiding such situations.

Marcia Armstrong was invited to help supply some information on the issue of federal nexus. The Federal Nexus comes into play in discretionary decisions such as permitting and funding through federal agencies. The Federal Nexus ceases when a contract is signed and a project is initiated. Marcia has an agreement with language to prevent additional restrictions or regulations on landowners which go beyond the original project scope. It is a qualified granted permission.

- ♦ **Outreach strategies to pursue immediately**

The idea of having a full page Pioneer Press insert sponsored by the Scott River Watershed Council quarterly came up. Since there is more room than the Council could probably fill up with an events calendar and news related to the Council, the committee had the idea of sponsoring a dialogue on some particular issue by soliciting a cross section of interest groups or their representatives to respond (eg the Federal Nexus issue, Forest Practice Rules, etc.).

- ♦ **Possibly combining meetings with Ed Committee**

The Community Relations and Education Committees will be meeting together on June 12, 2000.

- ♦ **Actions taken:**

- **Organize a meeting among Tailings Landowners, Tom Hesseldenz, USFWS, any other funding agency involved to work out agreement language acceptable to all which will protect the landowner from exposure to periphery ESA or Clean Water liabilities.**
- **Larry and Ric agreed to find cases where the Federal Nexus has been a landowner's problem as a result of agency funding for a project on their land.**
- **Prepare an agenda worksheet so that the Executive Council can attend a Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors meeting in July after the Fourth. Prepare 15 min "Power Point Presentation" that they can give.**
- **Call Bill Hoy and Jeff Fowle to discover any information they may have on the rumor that an agency wants to buy up riparian areas in the Shasta and Scott.**
- **Talk to Daniel Webster about doing the Watershed Council Pioneer Press insert.**

- ♦ **Next meeting date: Monday, June 12, 2000, 6 pm; Bob's Ranch House**

**Fish Committee
5-9-00 Meeting Report for
Scott River Watershed Council**

❖ Present: Larry Toelle, Dave Black, Jennifer Silveira, Gary Black, Jeffy Marx,
Coordinator

❖ Discussion

Upper Klamath Basin

- Jennifer gave background – BOR working on EIS/Flow Study- Council needs to obtain whatever documents are available
- Latest interim study allows for half of previous interim flows

Control of riparian areas

- Is private or public acquisition of riparian areas what we want in Scott? We need to keep ranchers in business
- Situation in Shasta
 - BLM & CDFG trying to buy Big Springs area
- Conservation easements in riparian areas

Fisheries Dialogue as educational event:

- Should take advantage of situation when Klamath Fisheries Management Council (KFMC) comes to Yreka in October. Will be in Weitchpec on February 23, 2001
- Karuks are trying to obtain a legal commercial fishery (would come out of current tribal allotment).
- Effects of net hole size on genetics of fish?
- Break discussion/presentations into “outside” and “inside” of the Scott watershed
- What spawning habitat capacity does the Scott have? Find the name of fellow who did a report on available spawning habitat a few years ago.
- Gather other such questions ahead of event.

Planning

- Need water balance in order to do accurate planning
- Include SVID management in planning efforts
- ❖ **Action items:**
 - Invite Kay Bryan to speak at June Council meeting on CalFed
 - Talk to Jim DePree about a County rep at next Council meeting
 - Seek spawning habitat capacity study
 - Obtain whatever documents are available from Upper Basin EIS and Flow Study

❖ **Agenda items for next meeting:**

- Planning
 - Things we can affect within the watershed
 - Outside watershed issues
- Education
- ❖ **Next meeting date: Tuesday, June 6, 2000, 8:30 am; USFS Conference Trailer on Bridge Street in Fort Jones.**

**Monitoring Committee
Report for 5-23-00 Meeting
to
Scott River Watershed Council**

Members present: Carl Schwarzenberg, Tom Shorey, Cliff Munson, Jeffy Marx, Coordinator

- ❖ It was decided that Tom Shorey would be the Monitoring Committee's Executive representative at the June 5th Executive meeting and the June 20th Council meeting and that Clifford Munson would be the Executive Representative for the July meeting.
- ❖ The goal and objectives of the committee were reviewed and somewhat revised:

Goal: To measure the restoration program at site specific and watershed levels to improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of past, present, and future projects.

Added:

- I. *E. Gather, organize and compile data in a useable format.*
F. Expand photo monitoring as an immediate and viable tool, especially with landowners.
G. Do a report on each parameter each year.
 - II. *A. Motivate landowners to monitor own management effects by offering workshops, field trips, technical assistance, and financial support on a sustained basis. (Bring in people from agencies which threaten or seem to threaten.)*
- ❖ The committee also discussed the Ken Tate landowner workshop coming up, and thought of some questions that should be asked of him:

Do all basins have such a wide variety of soils types as the Scott?

What are the TMDL parameters we need to look at and how do we prepare for them?

What are the things we need to do to prepare for the TMDL?

Land Committee 5-10-00 Meeting Report to Scott River Watershed Council

Present:, Gareth Plank, Doug Blangsted, Ernie Wilkinson, Jeffy Marx

The **Draft Upland Management Plan** was distributed for comment.

Forest Stewardship Workshop (letter from Gary Nakamura) was considered and it was decided that such a workshop, which is particularly aimed at small landowners with timber, would be a great idea for October or November. Jeffy will talk to Gary Nakamura about it.

Upland vegetative management experiment project development

The current vegetation management project on Gareth Plank's (CDF) can use some additional help on the following aspects:

Gathering baseline data

Technical expertise for the experimental aspects of project – contact John Menke and/or Gary Nakamura, possible doctoral or masters thesis project

Reestablishment of vegetation and grass

Impoundment of water for interim watering of new vegetation
Measurement of rate of infiltration- comparison of depth in different locations
Secondary treatment(?)

Proposal for JITW money

Will include some aspects of Plank project and include an additional site (Noyes Valley, Hayden, Walker, Dowling ?)
Historical research of upland vegetation changes

Federal Nexus Issue

Request the Community Relations Committee come up with specific examples of landowners being hung out to dry for having participated in a federally funded project. Want to seek ways to avoid such experiences here.

Next meeting date: Wednesday, June 7, 2000, 7 pm; Siskiyou RCD Office

**Water Committee
5/10/00 Meeting Report to Scott River Watershed Council**

Present: Ken Maurer, Jeff Fowle, Jeffy Marx

Even though attendance was very sparse, those present were very productive in writing up a draft goal and objectives for the committee:

DRAFT Goals and Objectives of Water Committee

Goal: Work for adequate water quantity and quality in the Scott River watershed to meet the migration, spawning, and rearing needs of salmon and steelhead stocks without limiting other beneficial uses.

Objectives:

1. Identify what times are critical to salmonid life cycles and what parameters are necessary within those times to maintain salmonid health.
2. Increase flows during periods critical to salmonid life cycles.
3. Reduce human-caused limiting factors on water quality.

Next meeting date: (proposed by Jeffy) Wednesday, June 14, 2000 (Flag Day) 7:30 am
Bob's Ranch House

**Scott River Watershed Council
Technical Committee Meeting Notes
5-19-00**

Present: Sari Sommarstrom, Jay Power, Gary Black, Jennifer Silveira, Tom Shorey, Jeffy Marx

Ranking procedures

- Problem:** On-the-ground projects with multiple elements and limiting factors being addressed may out score otherwise top priority projects such as fish screens
- Solution:** Maximum number of points in Section D (Limiting Factors) is 16
- Problem:** Conflict of interest situations where a Technical Committee member has vested interest in a project.
- Solution:** That person will not rank such projects.
- Decision:** Average the points of each person on each project and then rank them according to point averages

Ranking procedures for projects other than on-the-ground (ie education, organization, planning, study, research)

Discussion: E-H may need wider point spread; replace Section D for educational or organizational proposals with # of people affected or % of watershed affected; look at ERO rating forms; level of landowner/community participation; better not to force a numerical ranking between categories; should decide ahead of time how many in each category should be written up as proposals; cost benefit for educational projects is difficult to gage.

Decision: Jeffy will bring the CDFG ranking criteria for educational, organizational, study/research, planning

Tech Committee's role is primarily to help develop proposals, ok to use funder's criteria for ranking purposes

Recommendations to Council on project priorities: Fish screens; diversion list needs to be updated and prioritized.

State-of-the Watershed Annual Report

An annual meeting where the group critically reviews what they have done

Sari will get a copy of the Grand Ron (sp) report to look at

Types of information to include in report:

% fenced, fish screens completed and yet to complete, acres planted, activities done, monitoring report on temperature, sediment, fish counts, etc., USFS reports, miles road inventoried and repaired, see Sari's 5-year report for some information, gage station, map of fish distributions, snorkel counts, French Creek V* bar graphs, combine #'s from diverse sources.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 13, 2000, 8:30 am, USFS Conference Trailer, Fort Jones

1. Task Force Subbasin Plan Format; 2. Temperature monitoring results (Jennifer);
3. Criteria for other project types (CDFG – Jeffy); 4. Field trip in afternoon (?)

Standing Committee Reports to Scott River Watershed Council on April 18, 2000

Water Committee 3/29/00 Meeting Report

Present: Mike Bryan, Ken Maurer, Jay Power, Warren Farnam, Jeffy Marx

The following projects were discussed and the committee's recommendation on each one follows it. Numbers 1-4 will be sent to the Technical Committee:

1. Phase II of Water Balance to be resubmitted for funding – can be submitted to Technical Committee for review and rating without need to be returned to the Water Committee; possible contractors for the work are Mike Deas, Dr. Robert Willis Landowner water temperature monitoring- small watershed focus project with Ken Tate – UC Davis
2. Patterson Creek ditch piping – to be submitted to Technical Committee pending cost estimate
3. Sugar Creek Ditch piping – to be submitted to Technical Committee
4. *Landowner Riparian Planting Project –on a smaller scale to be submitted to the Technical Committee; will include some experimental companion planting of grasses to increase wildlife benefit and to help discourage the invasion of noxious weeds.
 - ◆ Companion planting in riparian areas to discourage noxious weeds and increase wildlife habitat – will include experiment in companion planting in the Landowner Riparian Planting Project
 - ◆ Headgates – recommend including them with fish screen proposals where feasible
 - ◆ Diversion Inventory – to be included in proposal seeking help with Scott River Action Plan
 - ◆ Cost-effectiveness study of piping ditches - will be included in proposals for implementation of ditch piping on Patterson and Sugar Creeks
 - ◆ Scott River Land and Water Trust – too controversial among members to recommend
 - ◆ Scott River Groundwater Plan – responsibility of County
 - ◆ Riparian fencing and planting (Martins) – has been funded through other grants
 - ◆ Shackleford Creek- clearing a channel at the mouth on a yearly basis for Chinook access; Gary Black may write this up although the Water Committee made no determination on it.

Recommendations to Education Committee:

Have Steve Orloff talk on the Irrigation Management Project.

Siskiyou County Department of Agriculture on noxious weeds and mapping.

Ken Maurer reported on some research, data analysis, and conclusions he has come to regarding necessary data collection.

The committee agreed that the data list he had corresponded a great deal to the parameters of part II of the Water Balance study which is being resubmitted for funding.

Agenda items for next meeting;

- ◆ Rescheduling of field trip
- ◆ Review everyone's write-up of goals and objectives

Next meeting: Wednesday, April 26, 2000, 7 pm; Bob's Ranch House, Etna

**Education Committee
3-30-00 Meeting Report**

Goal: *Being as receptive as we are projective, disseminate current and accurate natural resource information from varied sources and viewpoints in order to promote debate and informed decisions.*

Members present: Gareth Plank, Andrew Eller, Jeffy Marx, Coordinator

Question to put to whole committee: Do we need a quorum to make decisions?

Education Proposal

It was decided (because of lack of time for another meeting) that a separate proposal will be written rather than included in the Council funding as it is this year. It is important to assure a balanced view is represented in any educational presentations.

Educational Events:

There was some discussion on TMDL's and the correct approach. A community education piece in the newspaper as a quiz on resource terminology with prizes for correct answers from specific school classes was also discussed.

Next month's agenda suggestions: Workshop, educational meeting priority and schedule. Review letter sent to Ron Iverson and determine if a more specific request is needed in addition.

Next meeting date:

Although Thursday, April 27th was chosen, it needs to be changed.

**Fish Committee
3-29-00 Meeting Report**

❖ **Present:** Larry Toelle, Dave Black, Dennis Maria, Jim Kilgore, Don Judd, Brenda Olson, Jeffy Marx, Coordinator

❖ **Proposal decisions:**

The following proposals will be sent to the Technical Committee:

1. **Patterson comprehensive restoration – fish screen, stock water system, bank stabilization (keeping it as fish friendly as possible)**
2. **Fish screens – 1 on Wildcat, 1 on Miners, 1 on South Fork, Shackleford, pump screen**
3. **Fish Screen Users Handbook**
4. **Tailings flood plain project study pending all involved landowners agree**
5. ***Standing Crop Assessment (juvenile salmonid counts in tribs) – has been written by USFS and funded for one year in Scott; to be expanded to tribs?**
6. **Young's Dam passage improvement – pending agreement from SVID folks**

❖ **Planning:**

Diversion inventory and prioritization

Include diversion inventory in planning proposal

Possibility of temporary exemption for landowners participating in a diversion study,

assessment, MOA with agencies to the effect that if a violation exists and steps will be taken in the future, no immediate citation will be given. **Brenda O. can speak to NMFS about such a possibility.**

Big Slough fisheries possibilities (was a coho spawning area in 1960's (Dave B.)

High priorities:

More H2O for fish

Screens

Passage: Young's Dam

Out-migrant Trapping (**Jeffy will speak to Sam Williamson to see if he needs more funding for outmigrant trapping for next year, and she will put article in paper soliciting volunteers for helping with this year's trapping as they are short-handed.**)

Handbook for Screen Users

❖ Education Suggestion:

Don Judd telling his Alaskan commercial fishing stories (Fall 2000)

❖ **Fish Committee wants to go on record as supporting the Water Committee's encouragement of riparian protection and planting.**

❖ Next meeting date: **Tuesday, May 9, 2000, 8:30 am; USFS Conference Trailer on Bridge Street in Fort Jones.**

Monitoring Committee

Report for 3-29-00 Meeting

Members present: Andrew Eller, Lorrie Bundy, Carl Schwarzenberg, Dennis Maria, Tom Shorey, Jeffy Marx, Coordinator

Education Ideas:

Importance of road monitoring standardization!

Have a workshop focusing on monitoring techniques and their relative effectiveness (Invite Revital Catz Nelson, NCWQCB, Ken Tate, Applegate Watershed Council, Kelly Connor

Make PFC (Properly Functioning Condition) Workshop annual event

Road Monitoring Issues:

Tom Shorey, Fruit Growers, gave a report on the status of the Shackleford/Mill Inventory and upcoming implementation. The work plan, developed according to the inventory recommendations, is in the process. It will need to be reviewed by JITW/USFWS. Fruit Growers will have some additional funding from F&G to implement beyond the JITW money.

Implementation will be in the Shackleford drainage as it is an over-all high sediment priority. Tom also reported on the monitoring that has been going on and how FG is seeking new and improved sediment measuring procedures. The present monitoring includes: V*, pebble counts, temperature monitoring, photo monitoring, turbidity, bioassessment, stream condition monitoring. Fruit Growers is interested in any program \$ to help with turbidity monitoring especially in Moffett Creek, where Council/RCD has a sediment assessment funded.

Agenda items for next meeting:

- **Focus on project monitoring (need Gary Black present)**
- **Homework for committee members:** Read over goals and objectives and have any suggested changes in writing at next meeting

Next meeting: Tuesday, April 25, 8:30 am; Scott Valley Bank Conference Room, Fort Jones

Land Committee
4-10-00 Meeting Report to Scott River Watershed Council

Members present: Ernie Wilkinson, Gareth Plank, Stu Farber (Timber Products), Jim DePree, County Resource Specialist

Staff present: Jeffy Davis Marx

Jim DePree requested input from the Land Committee on a proposal for new rules on Forest Service roads, which include a roads analysis on the national level, no new roads without showing compelling need for them, and the decommissioning of unneeded roads because maintenance dollars are not available. Jim wanted the input because he was writing a comment to be submitted by Siskiyou County.

The members present made it clear that such a proposal, in their opinions added another layer of bureaucracy that would make sure that nothing was ever accomplished on the ground with regard to roads. We are currently doing road inventories throughout the watershed, and the decisions on roads should be made locally. The federal government needs to coordinate with the Siskiyou County Land Plan.

Stu Farber, Timber Products, came to the committee with a project proposal idea: a road inventory on Etna, North Fork of French Creek, and Clark's Creek on Timber Product land. The committee recommended that the other land owners/managers in the watershed be contacted to see if they were also interested in the inventory. Timber Products is willing to do the implementation of the road erosion reduction phase.

(Jeffy has since found other landowners and managers interested in pursuing such a project and she has written it up for the Tech Com.)

Further discussion of the project on upland vegetation's effects on infiltration and flows as well as an historical baseline established through photo and document research was tabled until the next meeting as it probably is not a candidate for fisheries funding. The no-till drill and noxious weed mapping were project ideas that were also tabled.

Next meeting date: Wednesday, May 10, 2000, 7 pm; Siskiyou RCD office

Community Relations Committee
4-17-00 Meeting Report
to the Scott River Watershed Council

Present: Ric Costales, Bernard Dowling, Mary Roehrich, Larry Toelle, Carolyn Pimentel, Jeffy Davis Marx

Goals, objectives, strategies

- ◆ Goal: Build a greater sense of community in order to develop a common vision.

Objectives:

- ◆ Build confidence in the Scott River Watershed Council process
- ◆ **Provide a practical forum to build confidence in seeking solutions to volatile issues**
- ◆ **Attract wider input from the community**

- ♦ **Convey a sense of empowerment and hope to people**

Strategies for achieving objectives:

- ♦ **Involve business community**
- ♦ **Have membership sign-up lists at meetings.**
- ♦ **Have members do presentations about the Council to other community groups**
- ♦ **Get newsletters out more frequently and to all boxholders. Try to use Pioneer Press Special Edition as a conduit and be willing to pay for space.**
- ♦ **Invite people from out of the area who have had similar experiences to those we are apt to have or are having.**
- ♦ **Send the Executive Council to a Siskiyou County Board meeting the County does not start sending a regular representative.**

The Committee also discussed ways to attract landowners to Ken Tate's May presentation. They encourage every person present at the April Council meeting to bring a few landowners to the May presentation. The emphasis is on the fact that Ken Tate is expecting an interactive event. He wants and needs landowner input. The presentation could be described as offering "tools for your own self-defense".

- ♦ **Next meeting date: Monday, May 15, 2000, 6 pm, Bob's Ranch House.**

❖ **Other discussion:**

- Fisheries issues outside the Scott watershed were discussed.
- The various fisheries management organizations: Klamath Fisheries Management Council, Pacific Fisheries Management Council, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (US/Canadian issues)

- Importance of smolt trapping (now going on) to see what we are producing.
- Tailings Project presentation and discussion:
Tom Hesseldenz: Update on tailing's project as revised: Phases: 1. Scoping, EIR (studies), interim pilot reach streambank work. 2. Flood plain widening through out tailings reach. 3. Quarrying under umbrella permits sought in phase 1.
Two landowner categories: those directly involved will sign consent agreements. Those possibly affected will have input during EIR process.
Wants to slow down the approvals process
Project may be expanding to 7 or 8 miles because of some downstream interested landowners.

CEQA/NEPA process provides opportunity for affected, non-participating landowners. Alternatives developed: No action. Creating floodplain. Set up for future quarrying. Flatten everything. Riprap whole 5 mile reach.

Studies are on hydrology. Species surveys are done. Look at economic impacts including potential future crusher sites. Detailed EIR now saves piecemeal permitting later. Key steps: Complete landowner approval. Do streambank stabilization this summer in pilot reach. New proposals now would fund permitting process, EIR, and all studies involved.

Fisheries benefits: slow healing process as fine sediment is allowed to fill in spades in cobble, possibly leading to riparian vegetation.

Larry Toelle has acted as scribe and spokesperson for a group of landowners with concerns over project, property rights. Requests that Tom H. slow down process and that he participate in SRWC process. Open scoping process. Moving ahead on the pilot reach on-the-ground project will bring confidence to opponents. To open scoping: more media coverage, put project through SRWC process, use the project to leverage more participation in SRWC. Wants to see language in proposal to target local people to be hired for work where possible. Questioning of Army Corps' legal involvement in these projects. Jennifer Silveira to bring in info connecting ACE to the Clean Water Act.

Standing Committee Reports to Scott River Watershed Council
3-21-00

Education Committee
3-1-00 Meeting Report

Members present: Andrew Eller, Wing Hodas, Bernard Dowling, Keith Taylor, Danielle Quigley

Wing Hodas can no longer serve as alternate representative because he is the Water Committee's representative to the Executive Council. A new alternate will need to be elected at the next meeting when more members are present.

Workshop ideas:

Industrial Hemp (Wing):

- ◆ Viable economic option for Scott Valley
- ◆ Wing has written to state senate members to no avail
- ◆ Danielle has materials available on industrial hemp and textiles manufactured from it. She will bring them next month.

Fisheries terminology (e.g. target species, ecological stability, TMDL, etc.)

- ◆ Publish monthly in paper
- ◆ History/introduction
- ◆ Legislation involved Keep it all neutral in tone
- ◆ Implications
- ◆ Bibliography of sources
- ◆ Include such topics as sea lions, sediment (what is "natural" sediment?)

Klamath Task Force:

Need to know what they want. Draft letter requesting to know their concerns and can they give us quantifiable information?

Letter from Education Committee or Council?

Announcement:

March 14, 2000 in Sacramento: public comment on State Board of Forestry Rules

Logging regulations will effect small timber

Shuttle provided by KARE

Next month's agenda suggestion:

Definitions of TMDL's, history/ timeline, what's required, purpose, pro/con, sources of information

Next meeting date (tentative): Wednesday, April 5, 2000, 6:30 pm; Scott Valley Bank

Monitoring Committee
2-14-00 Meeting Report

Members present: Andrew Eller, Lorrie Bundy (staff), Jeffy Marx (staff)

As few people were present, it was a short meeting.

Lorrie stated that she would resubmit the monitoring proposal for the years 2 and 3. (Year 1 was funded by the CDFG for 2000.) She wishes to include money for landowner monitoring. That would be about the only change from the original proposal.

Next meeting: Thursday, March 23, 2000, 8:30 am; Scott Valley Bank Conference Room, Fort Jones

Land Committee
3-14-00 Meeting Report to Scott River Watershed Council

Members present: Gareth Plank, Ray Haupt, Warren Farnam, Ernie Wilkinson

Staff present: Jeffy Davis Marx

Plan revisions: The committee reviewed and recommended a few revision to Scott River Watershed CRMP Upland Management Action Plan. This revised plan will be included in the information submitted for the Council strategic planning process.

Educational topic recommendations, also included in the Upland Plan as revised:

- ◆ Effects of vegetation amounts, species, and classes on stream flows
- ◆ Strategies to limit intrusion of brush and juniper and to introduce native grasses and/or other grasses or other less invasive native brushes.
- ◆ Effects of various types of vegetation on ground water absorption and snow pack
- ◆ Fire ecology
- ◆ Road design and management
- ◆ Effects and or limitations of soil types and conditions on vegetation
- ◆ Effects of vegetation management strategies on wildlife
- ◆ Seek alternatives to petrochemicals and detergents (targeting urban use)
- ◆ Survey and mapping of noxious plants

Projects:

Jeffy will write up on short proposal format an historical photo and literature research project with a goal of establishing an historical baseline for upland vegetation species, densities, and classes.

Study responses in 6 to 8 sites treated with different vegetation management strategies by monitoring ground water levels, water flows, and infiltration rates. If possible, also monitoring wildlife responses.

Provide the use of a no-till drill for upland grass planting.

Next meeting date: Monday, April 10, 2000, 7 pm; Siskiyou RCD office

Water Committee
3/16/00 Meeting Report to Scott River Watershed Council

Present: Mike Bryan, Lorrie Bundy, Bruce Bradford, Annie Bradford, Wing Hodas, Carolyn Pimentel, Jeffy Marx

Jeffy updated the committee on the Executive Council's recommendation for the strategic planning process.

Projects:

- ◆ Phase II of Water Balance to be resubmitted for funding – can be submitted to Technical Committee for review and rating without need to be returned to the Water Committee; possible contractors for the work are Mike Deas, Dr. Robert Willis
- ◆ Landowner water quality monitoring project with Dr. Ken Tate
- ◆ Piping of Patterson Creek ditch

Other ideas for future projects and their improvements:

- ◆ Increased and improved communications between project coordinators and participating landowners
- ◆ Work with power company on seeking breaks for alternative stock water systems
- ◆ Study the cost benefits of piping ditches
- ◆ Better engineering of stock water systems to minimize maintenance
- ◆ Channel reconfiguration at mouth of Shackleford Creek

Agenda items for next meeting;

- ◆ Rescheduling of field trip
- ◆ Review written up project ideas
- ◆ Review everyone's write-up of goals and objectives

Next meeting: Wednesday, March 29, 2000, 5 pm; Alberto's, Fort Jones

**Community Relations Committee
3-20-00 Meeting Report**

Present: Ric Costales, Mary Roehrich, Carolyn Pimentel, Jeffy Davis Marx

- ◆ Feelings on chairmanship: **Follow Executive Committee's recommendation for consistent chair and vice-chair for now.**
- ◆ Goals and objectives – share what each has written, brainstorm other points, compile:

Draft Goal: Build a greater sense of community in order to develop a common vision.

Draft Objectives:

- Build confidence in the Scott River Watershed Council process.
- Provide a comfortable climate for seeking solutions to volatile issues.

- ◆ Techniques/strategies for achieving goals:

Some mentioned:

- Involve the business community
- Have membership sign-up lists at meetings and events.
- Have members do presentations about the Council to other community groups.

- ◆ Next meeting date:

Monday, April 17, 2000, 6 pm; Bob's Ranch House

**Fish Committee
3-17-00 Meeting Report**

- ❖ Present: Larry Toelle, Danielle Quigley, Dave Black, Dennis Maria, Jim Kilgore, Jennifer Silveira, Don Judd, Tom Hesseldenz, Jeffy Davis Marx
- ❖ Representation: Larry Toelle is representative; Don Judd and Dave Black have consented to be alternates when they are here.
- ❖ Chairmanship: Would like to abide by Executive Council recommendation in this matter.
- ❖ Planning:
 - Larry Toelle summarized his idea for collecting community and all input for the Strategic and Action Plans for the Scott River watershed. (i.e. active solicitation and collection of any and all pertinent information from all sources to be kept in three ring binders which each committee and the coordinator and the RCD office have.)
 - Group wants to focus on obvious needs. Want Dennis and other fisheries people to pick out important tasks from the CRMP's *Fish Population and Habitat Plan* to use until the *Scott River Action Plan* is operational.
 - Fish screens remain obvious priority (pump intake screens as well)
- ❖ Project considerations:
 - 2 Fish Screens proposed by Lorrie Bundy will go to Technical Committee.
 - Fish screen maintenance manual will go to Technical Committee.
 - Tailings Project, presented by Tom Hesseldenz, will be brought back to next committee meeting for consideration.
- ❖ Next meeting date: Wednesday, March 29, 2000, 8:30 am; USFS Conference Trailer on Bridge Street in Fort Jones.

❖ **Other discussion:**

- Fisheries issues outside the Scott watershed were discussed.
- The various fisheries management organizations: Klamath Fisheries Management Council, Pacific Fisheries Management Council, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (US/Canadian issues)
- Importance of smolt trapping (now going on) to see what we are producing.
- Tailings Project presentation and discussion:
Tom Hesseldenz: Update on tailing's project as revised: Phases: 1. Scoping, EIR (studies), interim pilot reach streambank work. 2. Flood plain widening through out tailings reach. 3. Quarrying under umbrella permits sought in phase 1.
Two landowner categories: those directly involved will sign consent agreements. Those possibly affected will have input during EIR process.
Wants to slow down the approvals process
Project may be expanding to 7 or 8 miles because of some downstream interested landowners.

CEQA/NEPA process provides opportunity for affected, non-participating landowners. Alternatives developed: No action. Creating floodplain. Set up for future quarrying. Flatten everything. Riprap whole 5 mile reach.

Studies are on hydrology. Species surveys are done. Look at economic impacts including potential future crusher sites. Detailed EIR now saves piecemeal permitting later. Key steps: Complete landowner approval. Do streambank stabilization this summer in pilot reach. New proposals now would fund permitting process, EIR, and all studies involved.

Fisheries benefits: slow healing process as fine sediment is allowed to fill in spaces in cobble, possibly leading to riparian vegetation.

Larry Toelle has acted as scribe and spokesperson for a group of landowners with concerns over project, property rights. Requests that Tom H. slow down process and that he participate in SRWC process. Open scoping process. Moving ahead on the pilot reach on-the-ground project will bring confidence to opponents. To open scoping: more media coverage, put project through SRWC process, use the project to leverage more participation in SRWC. Wants to see language in proposal to target local people to be hired for work where possible. Questioning of Army Corps' legal involvement in these projects. Jennifer Silveira to bring in info connecting ACE to the Clean Water Act.

III

Now What?

According to the regional board's schedule, the TMDL for the Scott River will be set in 2005. That gives the people in the Scott time to gather their own data so that arbitrary limits extrapolated from some other totally different system are not used to set limits in the Scott.

The whole process for the TMDL report and the three step implementation will be explained to some extent in an article in next week's Pioneer Press.

Improving the water quality in the Scott River has been a clear objective of the Watershed Council from the start. That desire is tempered, however, by a cautious and pro-active attitude toward further regulation. The Watershed Council is and has always been of the opinion that the health of the watershed depends on the viability of a vigorous community of resident landowners, including sustainable forestry and ranching.

In light of that opinion, some information and some tools for protecting landowner management activities from potentially arbitrary regulation will be offered on Tuesday, May 30, 2000 at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview. The public is invited to hear and talk with Ken Tate, UC Extension Watershed Specialist from Davis, who will be presenting landowner techniques for monitoring their own water quality. In addition to the presentation, the Council will serve a free spaghetti dinner before hand to which the public is also invited. Dinner is a 6 pm and the presentation/discussion is at 7pm.

Dear Daniel,

Please print this article in the May 17th edition of the Press. I have emailed it as well. I hope that it is not too awfully long. I will send another, follow-up article next week. Let me know if something is not clear.

Thank you, Jeffy

5-11-00

Ready or Not, Here Come the TMDL's Total Maximum Daily Loads

What does this acronym mean? Knowing the words represented sheds little light on the significance.

TMDL's are a new form of water-quality regulation. Several watersheds in northern California have already undergone a process to determine how much of a particular pollutant is allowed before some form of enforcement comes down on the perpetrator(s). The Garcia River, Redwood Creek in Humboldt County, and the South Fork of the Trinity River have already undergone a process to set the pollutant levels on their streams.

Background

TMDL's advent in northern California is a result of the federal Clean Water Act of 1972. The law is aimed at controlling water pollution to protect what it calls "beneficial uses", which can be anything from drinking water to aquatic life and recreation. The law was passed when many streams were so dirty that some rivers and lakes in the East and Midwest caught fire. At first, regulators focused on the most obvious and dramatic sources of pollution especially near urban areas, such as untreated municipal sewage and refineries. These are called "point sources" of pollution in that they are significant amounts of pollutants coming from a single pipe.

Regulators then turned their attention to "non-point sources", which are spread out across a landscape, individually small, but collectively large. The Scott River has been designated by the North Coast Water Quality Control Board as having water quality impaired by high temperature and sediment.

A lawsuit brought by the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association and twelve other organizations forced the US Environmental Protection Agency to set limits on how much pollution could be discharged into streams on the North Coast, where water quality was listed as impaired. The Scott River is among those streams.

The responsibility to protect these streams falls to the state North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (regional board) through setting a ceiling for how much of each pollutant the stream can tolerate every day. That ceiling is its Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). Rules and plans then establish how the discharges into the stream will be brought within those limits, taking into account the natural background sources and the human activities in the area.

Scott River

Continued from Page 7

longer be at the mercy of large corporations.

Buckminster Fuller said: "You never change anything by fighting the existing. To change something, build a new model and make the existing obsolete."

The crux of the matter is that we have much to gain from working together and seeking a common vision. Vision is what will keep this valley from going the way of badly developed and paved over communities. The Scott Valley Plan was way ahead of its time in the 1970's and still stands as a model of what people of this valley can do with a united vision.

Come share your vision at the next Scott River Watershed Council meeting.

It will be held at the United Methodist Church in Etna at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, April 18, 2000. This meeting will be mostly dedicated to the review of proposed projects..

Scott River Watershed

By Jeffy Davis Marx

How do we separate the politics from the resource issues? Each side on an issue tells of the improprieties and the evil intentions of the other. The community is polarized by politics. The resources and environment may suffer the consequences. That polarization will most likely have negative economic consequences as well. Why can we not unite?

The lovely Scott Valley to most is a paradise. It is, indeed, compared to many places, a natural wonderland

with all kinds of recreational opportunities in the valley and in the mountains. Many live here because they like to work out of doors. That is why most of us live here. The ranches and fields ringed by snow-capped mountains are a sight to behold, one we never tire of. We have a great deal in common. Clarence Dudley, a long-time resident and rancher, agrees with me when I speak of my dream of this valley as sort of utopia apart from the rest of the frantic world, where we could create our own economy, no

Continued on Page 8

4-13-00

By Jeffy Davis Marx

It seems as if years have past since February's Watershed Council report. I've spent three weeks tending to my daughter and new grandson after his birth in Panama. Physical distance creates a distortion in one's sense of time. Despite my great reluctance to leave the little fellow behind, all is well there, and I return with great vigor to the task of helping this wonderful Scott Valley community to work together on issues affecting its natural and economic health.

For those of you who have not received the latest Council Newsletter in the mail, you can request that one be sent to you by calling me at 467-3798 or stopping by the Siskiyou RCD office in Etna, in back of City Hall. This newsletter issue explains the Watershed Council process as it is presently set up. It does not, however, tell the names of community members who were elected to the Executive Council, the voting body of the group which can pass motions by a supermajority vote (5 out of 6). The purpose of the Executive Council is to reduce the size of the voting membership to a more manageable

size. This does not preclude the group from seeking unanimous agreement from the entire Council when possible.

In February each of the six standing committees chose a representative and alternate to the Executive Council. The representative for the following committees are:

- Community Outreach: Ric Costales
- Education Committee: Gareth Plank
- Fish Committee: Larry Toelle
- Land Committee: Ernie Wilkinson
- Monitoring Committee: Andrew Eller
- Water Committee: Wing Hodas

We are fortunate to have a group of such fine people dedicated to the health of the resources and economy and willing to volunteer many hours a month for everyone's benefit. The committees are currently soliciting project ideas from the community. Landowners and others with ideas on projects can attend committee meetings or the regular March Watershed Council meeting.


The public is invited to the next Scott River Watershed Council meeting at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21, at the Fort Jones Community Center. Strategic Planning will be one of the topics on the agenda.

Fish trapping device installed on Scott

FORT JONES - A juvenile fish trapping device has been installed in the middle of the Scott River to count and assess the health of young steelhead, chinook and coho salmon.

Fish biologists and trained technicians will use the trap to count the number of species, determine their age, and closely examine the young fish to assess their life history and health. After the information is gathered, the fish are released to continue their journey down river.

Located near the community of Scott Bar, the highly visible eight foot wide rotating trap has been installed by fish biologists from the Klamath National Forest and California Department of Fish and Game. The trap, placed near the mouth of Pat Ford Creek, is held in place by suspension cables. To ensure the safety of river users, the rotating device was strategically placed near the middle of the river.



Fish screw trap in Scott River at Cabin Hole.

highly visible trap is easily seen by floaters and kayakers, and provides sufficient time for the river users to navigate around the device.

The information gathered by biologists will be combined with data from other

being collected in the Shasta and Klamath Rivers. This data will help to evaluate the fish restoration efforts ongoing in local rivers.

The count will continue until sometime next

Please print this article in the February 9th edition of the Press. If you come across the article that I sent on Monday, January 31st, do not print it. This article contains a partial rewrite of that one which you must have over-looked.

Thank you, Jeffy
2/3/00

Scott River Watershed Council Report
By Jeffy Davis Marx

An Opportunity to Serve Your Community

The Scott River Watershed Council is slowing down on its reorganization phase although readjustments in the process may be necessary from time to time. Simultaneously, the Council is looking at project opportunities.

Good participation has marked the last few months' meetings. The six standing committees and their work are the foundation of the Council activity: Community Relations, Education, Water, Fish, Monitoring, and Land Committees. Although quite a few people have signed up for each of these, the Council would like to be sure that the Scott Valley community is aware of them so that anyone who is interested may participate. The process is always open. So, please feel free to attend any of the committee meetings in which you may be interested. Just come to see what it is like. My experience so far is that the mix of members makes for lively, but cordial, conversation on community resource issues. Such a forum is healthy for the community.

Although there is a wide array of interests in the group, it must be mentioned that most of the participants are men. Absolutely nothing is wrong with men; it would just make a more balanced group if more women would participate, so come on girls, give it a try.

One of the main purposes of the committees is to hear and to help develop project ideas brought to them by community members. Anyone interested in bringing forth an idea is most welcome. A main purpose of the committees is to help community members to connect to the process with or without necessarily participating on a regular basis. Anyone who is not sure to which committee he or she should go with an idea, call Jeffy Davis Marx at 467-3798.

Committee Meeting Schedule:

Community Relations:	Thursday, February 10, 2000, 6:30 pm Siskiyou RCD Office, Etna
Education Committee:	Wednesday, March 1, 2000, 6:30 Scott Valley Bank Conference Room, Fort Jones
Water Committee:	Wednesday, February 9, 2000, 4:30 Scott Valley Bank Conference Room, Fort Jones
Fish Committee:	Tentative: Friday, March 17, 2000, 8:30 am Forest Service Compound Conference Room Bridge Street, Fort Jones
Monitoring Committee:	Tuesday, March 14th, 8:30 am Scott Valley Bank Conference Room, Fort Jones
Upland (Land Use) Committee:	Tuesday, March 14, 2000, 6:30 Siskiyou RCD Office, Etna

10 Local News

Scott River Watershed Council Report

By Jeffy Davis Marx

All the folks who attended the Council meeting on December 14th are to be commended for their teamwork and intelligence in the effort to get the process rolling again. The meeting was well-attended, dynamic and highly participatory.

It is difficult to decide what to keep and what to reject of the previous and, at once, parallel, watershed group's efforts. After all, many watershed restoration and protection projects which were funded as a result of the CRMP's efforts are now either completed, in progress, or have just been funded. What of the previous effort do we need to do better? What worked so well that we need to retain it? We do not need to reinvent the wheel, but it can use some refinements (what can't?). Maybe some ball-bearings would improve the functioning.

The Council has requested that Sari Sommarstrom, who was the original CRMP Coordinator, report to them on a study recently written by her and by Charles Huntington. The study evaluated selected watershed groups in the Pacific Northwest and Northern California according to their effectiveness in developing and implementing restoration plans, their processes, and their conservation effectiveness. All of these elements are difficult to measure by any single set of standards, as every watershed and its community are different, but I am sure that Sari can offer some tidbits of wisdom gathered from other groups' collective experiences. The Scott River Watershed Council has requested that, on the basis of her study, she make recommendations to this group. The Council is presently focused on setting up the group process, although recommendations in other areas such as planning and project implementation are welcome.

Many local citizens have signed up for participation on the committees, but more are always welcome. Emphasis is on an open process, in which all interested parties are welcome. If you have interest in conservation as it pertains to Water, Fish, Land Use, Monitoring, Education or Community Outreach please feel free to come to the January meeting and sign up for one of these committees or simply call Jeffy Davis Marx at 467-3798. You do not need to attend big ol' meetings in order to participate in the Watershed Council process.

For those of you who participate in your own subwatershed group, such as, Shackleford/Mill, Moffett, French Creek, Tailings, or Sugar Creek should make sure that someone from your group is representing your interests in one or more of the Council's committees.

The next Scott River Watershed Council meeting will be held at the Fort Jones Community Center on Tuesday, January 18, 7 p.m. The public is invited and encouraged to attend.

previous Thursday, Dec. 23, and there was still plenty of light reflecting off the snow, they said.

The trial, being held in you County Superior Court Judge Robert Kaster's court, has now been put on hold for another week while the boy's body is autopsied again. The pathologist who performed the first autopsy, Dr. Orazio Rosolia, estimated the size and weight of the boy, as well as his organs. This, along with the fact that the doctor's license was under suspension by at least one state agency during the time he performed the autopsy, gave the court ample cause to request the exhumation and further

was not found until six days later, when search dogs finally were brought in.

"We begged them to bring in dogs from the very beginning," Koeger said tearfully. "I believe my son was murdered." Koeger added that she did not mean by that that the defendants were any less responsible for her son's death, because they had provided him alcohol many times before the night he disappeared.

Meanwhile, defendant Espranza Saucedo-Fogle was taken to the emergency room last week for severe abdominal cramping. She was excused from court the rest of that day.

The jury is expected to return to hear testimony the week of May 24.

Cattle may be needed

Continued from front page

Girdling means the bark has been eaten from the circumference of the young tree. This kills a conifer, where willows will re-sprout, according to Black.

The study also suggests that cattle grazing in the spring will reduce noxious weeds that are not indigenous to the area and have become a plague to land owners. Within two years of a - no cattle grazing program - property owners have found alien noxious weeds out-compete the natural vegetation. Star thistle, Canadian thistle and mullen that grows 10 feet high, are not natural to the Scott River riparian area and have become very thick.

The balance has been upset according to Black.

"The Department of Fish and Game has realized that some managed grazing may be a benefit in certain," said Black.

Projects have been funded to write grazing plans for

riparian areas. As a project coordinator for the SRCD, Black writes grants as land owners request assistance on specific projects.

The new grazing project "hasn't happened yet," and Black added that cattle grazing in riparian areas will be done in a conservative manner. Perhaps, cattle will be turned into the area for several short periods in the spring and fall.

"It is very obvious we need something to clean this out," said Black of the area that is nearly two feet deep with grass and vegetation. The young dead trees can be spotted with chew marks from the mice.

SRCD works closely with the California Department of Fish and Game in the development of projects.

"We see the Fish and Game as one of the more progressive agencies in seeking out solutions that are a win-win situation for land owners as well as for the wild life habitat," said Black.

Middle Eastern Festival will be held Wednesday, May 19, from 5:30 to 7 p.m. at the

amphitheater.

Mason Weaver, candidate for the 74th Assn

Tree cutting

Continued from front page

then existing trees, and fenced the area in 1966. Since then, oak and pine trees have grown up in the field. The Anthonys purchased the property less than two years ago and decided to improve the field by replanting a forage crop.

Several witnesses turned the Anthonys in when they saw the trees being cut or hauled out. The Anthonys did not sell their trees.

The property is zoned Prime Agriculture not Timberland Production Zone.

The case is sensitive, according to private property owners, because the district attorney's office is using a circuit prosecutor from a statewide Environmental Prosecutor Program.

Larry Brown, the executive director of the California District Attorney's Association, explained that the Environmental Prosecutor Program was started in order

to offer expertise involving environmental crimes. The CDAA restate and federal grants fund the Environmental Prosecutor Program, spring of 1998 and the profit CDAA administers funds writing the pay to the circuit prosecutor.


There were 20 private property owners in the audience at the pre-trial hearing on

Representing Environmental Prosecutor program at the pre-trial, Larry Allen from the County office, who has deputized as a Scott County District Attorney, indicated to Kelly, that not be the prosecutor of the case. But, another prosecutor, Barry D. may travel up from the in Redding in July.

Kelly said not much happening until the which is expect three days.

Bob's Ranch House

Breakfast • Lunch • Dinner



We feature

Homemade Pies

Banquet Facilities Available

Open 7 Days

Mon.-Sat.	6 am - 9 pm
Sunday	7 am - 9 pm

585 Collier Way • Etna • 467

Cattle may be needed to protect salmon habitat

By Liz Bowen

SCOTT VALLEY - After years of complaints about ruination of natural habitat by cattle grazing, new evidence suggests that managed cattle grazing may aid rehabilitation of salmon habitat.

Riparian areas next to the Scott River that have experienced several years of natural growth of native grasses and non-native noxious weeds by excluding any cattle grazing have become the habitat for an abundant mice population.

That increase in rodents is now killing young willow trees and conifer trees planted with the intention of improving salmon riparian habitat.

Recent surveys by the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District (SRCD) on Scott River riparian restoration projects, have found that an increase of noxious weeds and grass-type of vegetation provides a safe and favorable habitat for mice. In their need for more food, as their population increased in February and March, Gary Black, project coordinator for the SRCD, began finding willow and conifer trees that had been girdled by the rodents.

"The willow trees will come back, but lose this year's growth," said Black, "but the conifers are obviously gnomers."

Continued on back page



Photo by Liz Bowen

New concept — cattle grazing may be needed in riparian areas. Gary Black, project coordinator for the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District, explains that an abundant mice population is eating and killing young trees along the Scott River. In areas where cattle have been totally excluded, it has now been discovered by government agencies, that it becomes overgrown with tall grass and non-native noxious weeds. The resulting thick vegetation has protected the mice from natural predators, but now the over-eating by the mice threatens potential salmon habitat.

Trial date set for alleged timber conversion

By Liz Bowen

requires several steps. One is to inform the public. The next is to fill out the two-page

What really happened to Travis Burke

By Maggle Maguire

YREKA - His blood alcohol content was 0.12 percent half again the legal limit drive. But Travis Burke wasn't driving the night disappeared, and the last people who allegedly saw him alive told police they believe the boy was very drunk.

His mother believes the boy was murdered, but according to prosecution witness Travis Burke had too much to drink on Friday, Dec. 1998, at the home Esprado-Fogle shared with her boyfriend, Travis Chadwell. The pair, along with 19-year-old Nicholas Hernandez, are charged with providing the liquor to Burke and several of his teens consumed the liquor. Burke disappeared. The teens are standing in on charges of felony endangering and the speculation of causing will harm or injury resulting

Continued on back page

8/5/99

THE CRMP CORNER

By Jeffv Davis Marx

Sometimes knowledge impairs one's previously oblivious happiness. As I walk streams and rivers, even drive by them, I rarely think about the natural beauty of them any more. Because I have learned quite a bit about how the ecology of waterways in the last three years, I look with a highly critical eye at what I once considered unequivocally beautiful.

I am not naïve enough to think that all streams should look the same, even if they were all functioning perfectly. There are many different kinds of healthy riparian areas. I have, however, realized that there are some common characteristics which are present in most.

As I have learned, I have also tried to teach others, with whom I come in contact. One of the best ways to encourage good stewardship is to point out some good management techniques. Most management damaging to our streams is due to ignorance on the part of the landowner, not malice. If each of us citizens who recognizes a detrimental land management activity would just mention it in a kind way to our neighbors, it could save some regulatory difficulties for that person and for all of us down the line.

For instance, how many of you know what "tail water" is and why it can be damaging to stream health? It is the surplus water running off of an irrigated area back into the stream. The problem with that is that in many cases the water has heated up and may have picked up some nutrients which it carries back to the stream. In some cases, large landowners have built ponds to capture that water in such a way that it returns only by seepage from the bottom. That has the effect of cooling and filtering the water before its reentry. There are other techniques also. The Natural Resource Conservation Service (formerly the Soil Conservation Service) has been helping landowners for years with managing such problems. Many ranchers know of this service, but the smaller landowners do not.

The next Scott River Watershed CRMP meeting will be held at the Fort Jones Community Center, at 7 PM on Tuesday, August 17, 1999. The Siskiyou County Resource Specialist, Jim DePree will give an update on the groundwater plan which the County is doing, in accordance with the County Groundwater Ordinance passed last year. The public is invited to attend.

9/10/99

THE CRMP CORNER

By Jeffy Davis Marx

Each of us needs to constantly remind ourselves of our own lifetime's insignificance in the over-all picture in order to be able to better understand natural processes that have gone on for centuries and millenia. As one ages, the broader picture becomes clearer, especially if one has paid attention to history and listened to elders.

The Scott River Watershed CRMP has been taping interviews of some of the Valley's elders for several years. CRMP member and Scott Valley native, Mary Roehrich, has spearheaded this effort. Videotapes of the interviews are housed in the Siskiyou RCD office behind the Etna City office.

An AmeriCorps volunteer, Paloma Galindo, took it upon herself to edit, add music and old photographs to a taped interview of Orel Lewis, taped in 1995. Yreka Community Television aired that video last month. The questions have to do mostly with the river, weather, forestry, and fisheries. Anyone interested is welcome to check out a copy of this video or any of the others from the Siskiyou RCD office, 467-3975. Some of the other folks interviewed so far are Frank Hayden, Charlie Thom, Betty Hall, Dot Luce, Jim Denny, Ernest "Doc" Hovendon, Jessie Hammond, Bud Tozier, and "Pinky" Bill Matthews.

The next Scott River Watershed CRMP Council meeting will be held Tuesday, September 21, 1999 at the United Methodist Church in Etna at 7 pm. The public is welcome to attend. There will be no special educational portion this month.

10/8/99

THE CRMP CORNER

By Jeffy Davis Marx

According to reports, the chinook salmon are ready and waiting to run at the mouth of the Scott River. They have started up the Shasta River. Shasta irrigation systems shut down generally on September 30th so that the flows there have increased accordingly. On the Scott the irrigation shut-off date is October 15th. There is no measurable rain in the forecast as of today. That may have changed somewhat by the time this paper is on the stands. In case it has not, if anyone not needing their water right now can find the time and the place in their hearts for the fish, it would be of great benefit to the fish turn unneeded water back to the stream.

Doing our part for the fish is important. Knowing that there are many other factors that affect their survival is also important. Doing our part to improve the piece of their lives that we can affect is a generous and unselfish attitude. It is understandable that people here are disgusted with over-fishing, protected predators, and all the marine factors which greatly reduce the survival rate of anadromous fish. What we can do about that is to unite and become very proactive politically. Many people in Siskiyou County are taking that necessary step. Simultaneously, we can play our own little good-stewardship role in making spawning as easy as possible for the running kings.

The next Scott River Watershed CRMP Council meeting will be held Tuesday, October 19, 1999 at the Fort Jones Community Center at 7 pm. The public is welcome to attend. A half-hour video on Self-Governing Irrigation Systems will be shown at the beginning of the meeting.

County supervisors tackle full agenda

BY NICOLE MURPHY
Daily News Staff Writer

YREKA — The Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors handled a number of issues this week, running the gamut from A to Z — animal control to zone changes, including Census 2000 and voter outreach.

Animal Control

Following a public hearing and receiving no public response, the board adopted a resolution to waive requisite six-day holding times for relinquished and impounded ani-

mals until July 1, 2000.

State holding requirements had been changed from 72 hours to six days effective July 1, 1999. However, extensions were made possible under certain circumstances by means of county resolutions.

Siskiyou County Animal Control places dogs into the City of Yreka's facility. Space has become a problem for the city's facility, which has no room for adequate expansion.

"This resolution would allow us, if we need to, to go back to old holding times," said Agriculture Com-

missioner Bill Stephens.

He assured the board, however, that animal control would remain "true to the spirit" of the recently legislated six-day holding period. "We want to adopt out as many dogs as we possibly can."

In the meantime, a separate county impound facility is in the planning stages, and possible grant funding for the project is being sought.

According to Stephens, the facility would cost between \$110,000 and \$160,000.

Asphalt plant locations

The Planning Department received board approval to conduct an initial analysis to consider a code amendment to allow the temporary location of concrete and asphalt batch plants outside of heavy industrial areas.

"The board is well aware of the contentious nature of this issue," said planner Wayne Virag, but noted it was important to "acknowl-

See SUPERVISORS on page 3

au, cattlemen's group quit watershed council

tor of the Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association and the Siskiyou County Farm Bureau said last week that "a task force made up of two commercial fishing groups with no representation from agriculture, mining, timber or the environment is a travesty."

"We have decided that the groups that we want to be involved with are landowner-based groups with landowners making the decisions. Scott River CRMP is not a group of

landowners," Armstrong said.

"The only way we can help salmon is when the landowner knows what he is planning on doing will do to salmon, and then can make an informed decision.

If we take the landowner away from the decision-making process, he cannot help you," Armstrong told the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force at its meeting in Yreka on Friday.

In a letter to the Scott River CRMP dated Oct. 18, Armstrong said "The so-called multi-interest CRMP removes the decision-making and educational process from the landowner, vesting it in a political council of interest groups and agencies.

"The format/membership of the Scott River CRMP creates a disconnect between the decision makers and the decision implementers and has

become another unnecessary bureaucratic level."

The Farm Bureau and the Cattlemen's Association continue to support "on-the-ground" projects being implemented in Scott Valley, Armstrong said.

She said the groups hope to see those projects expand in the future with technical support made available through the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District.

Ann Landers.....7
Bookings.....2
Calendar.....7
Classified.....12
Comics.....11
Crossword.....11

Lottery.....2
Obituaries.....2
Opinion.....4
Sports.....10
Stocks.....5
Weather.....2

Parade applications available

Applications for entries in the annual Yreka Holiday Parade, to be held Nov. 27, at 11 a.m., are available at the Yreka Chamber of Commerce, on the corner of Broadway and Miner streets in downtown Yreka. The deadline is Nov. 22.

NATION

Dole abandons bid for president

PAGE 14

.....
now he
doesn't
again."

— **Mario
Novello**
public
defender

The victim fled the area after the alleged attack, the Siskiyou County Sheriff's Department told she feared for her safety and had delayed reporting the attack, which she said happened on Aug. 15.

She told authorities Garner was upset with her for not calling to let him know where she was. She reported that Garner used a baseball bat to knock the windshield and headlights out of her car. When she tried to

See PLEA on page 3

County supervisors tackle full

BY NICOLE MURPHY
Daily News Staff Writer

mals until July 1, 2000.
State holding requirements had been changed from 72 hours to six days effective July 1, 1999. However, extensions were made possible under certain circumstances by means of county resolutions.

Siskiyou County Animal Control places dogs into the City of Yreka's facility. Space has become a problem for the city's facility, which has no room for adequate expansion.

"This resolution would allow us, if we need to, to go back to old holding times," said Agriculture Com-

missioner Bill Stephens.
He assured the board, however, that animal control would remain "true to the spirit" of the recently legislated six-day holding period. "We want to adopt out as many dogs as we possibly can."

In the meantime, a separate county impound facility is in the planning stages, and possible grant funding for the project is being sought.

According to Stephens, the facility would cost between \$110,000 and \$160,000.

YREKA — The Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors handled a number of issues this week, running the gamut from A to Z — animal control to zone changes, including Census 2000 and voter outreach.

Animal Control

Following a public hearing and receiving no public response, the board adopted a resolution to waive requisite six-day holding times for relinquished and impounded ani-

BY PAT ARNOLD
Daily News Staff Writer

YREKA — Citing frustration over what they consider an unfair decision-making process, the Siskiyou County Farm Bureau and the Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association have announced their resignation from the Scott River Watershed CRMP Council.

Marcia Armstrong, executive direc-

tor of the Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association and the Siskiyou County Farm Bureau said last week that "a task force made up of two commercial fishing groups with no representation from agriculture, mining, timber or the environment is a travesty."

"We have decided that the groups that we want to be involved with are landowner-based groups with landowners making the decisions. Scott River CRMP is not a group of

landowners," Armstrong said.

"The only way we can help salmon is when the landowner knows what he is planning on doing will do to salmon, and then can make an informed decision."

If we take the landowner away from the decision-making process, he cannot help you," Armstrong told the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force at its meeting in Yreka on Fri-

In a letter to the Scott River CRMP dated Oct. 18, Armstrong said "The so-called multi-interest CRMP removes the decision-making and educational process from the landowner, vesting it in a political council of interest groups and agencies."

"The format/membership of the Scott River CRMP creates a disconnect between the decision makers and the decision implementers and has

Farm bureau, cattlemen's group quit watershe

INSIDE

Parade applications available

Applications for entries in the annual Yreka Holiday Parade, to be held Nov. 27, at 11 a.m., are available at the Yreka Chamber of Commerce, on the corner of Broadway and Miner streets in downtown Yreka. The deadline is Nov. 22.

Ann Landers.....	7	Lottery.....	2
Bookings.....	2	Obituaries.....	2
Calendar.....	7	Opinion.....	4
Classified.....	12	Sports.....	10
Comics.....	11	Stocks.....	5
Crossword.....	11	Weather.....	2

NATION

Dole abo

"It's easier for kids to learn through an experience like this," she said. "It's a good learning tool for the kids, but mainly I just wanted them to come out here and

See HORSE SHOW on page 3



DAILY NEWS PHOTOS/JOHN BURGARE
Deanna Cooper was one of over 40 entries participating in the Halloween Horse Show on Sunday at the Siskiyou Golden Fair grounds. Sponsored by 4-H, the show was coordinated by of Etna High School student Tara Mortenson as her senior project.

Scott River CRMP membership dwindles

Forest Service resigns from watershed group

BY PAT ARNOLD
Daily News Staff Writer

YREKA — The U.S. Forest Service has resigned from the Scott River Watershed CRMP, leaving only six voting members.

Carolyn Pimentel, program manager for the CRMP, announced the resignation at the watershed seminar in Yreka on Monday.

When the Scott River CRMP was organized in 1992, it consisted of 18 voting members.

Pimentel says that on the advice of legal counsel, the Forest Service has

Pimentel says the bylaws of the Scott River CRMP state that non-participation by a voting member can cost them their voting privileges.

Only attendance at a number of consecutive meetings can get those voting privileges reinstated. This and the problems some representatives have had in finding people who could attend on a regular basis, have all contributed to the number of vacancies in voting members on the Scott River CRMP.

An ad hoc committee has been appointed by the Scott River CRMP to evaluate the organization and consider a different format that may be more appealing for landowner participation and create a group

more representative of landowners in the Scott Valley area.

Jeffy Davis-Marx, coordinator for the Scott River CRMP, says that the committee is making an effort to attract people back into the process.

"Everyone presently represents some interest group with only a few landowners at large," Davis-Marx said. "The hope is that representatives can participate as a community group, rather than people battling each other to promote their own interest group."

The ad hoc committee has developed a recommendation to be presented to CRMP members at its next regular meeting set for Nov. 16 at 7 p.m. at the Etna United Methodist

Church.

The agenda for that meeting will contain a copy of the recommendation, which will be mailed prior to the meeting.

Davis-Marx encourages people in the community, both past and present members, to attend and present their input as to what they think of the committee's recommendations for restructuring the Scott River CRMP.

"We want this to be a community process, and want to encourage our old members, current members and even new people to participate," Davis-Marx said.

Davis-Marx can be contacted at 467-3798 for more information on the November meeting.

Ann Landers.....7
Bookings.....2
Calendar.....7
Classified.....12
Comics.....11
Crossword.....11

Lottery.....2
Obituaries.....2
Opinion.....4
Sports.....9
Stocks.....5
Weather.....2

COMING WEDNESDAY

Yreka High School's Journalism class is putting the finishing touches on its student-run newspaper. The first issue of Minor Press debuts Friday, with features designed to interest the community beyond the high school, the paper's editors say.

NATION

Jet crash offers no easy answers
page 5

major changes

By Frank Schall

SCOTT VALLEY - Sweeping changes, including near-unanimous votes by the full executive committee in order for passage of decisions, are on the drawing board for the CRMP.

Several other changes were proposed by the CRMP ad hoc reorganization committee at its October 26, meeting.

Other proposed changes, to be discussed at the November 16 CRMP meeting at the United Methodist Church in Etna, include:

- changing the name of the organization to "Scott River Watershed Council;"

- all members are to serve as individuals, not as representatives of any group;

- all decisions must be made by a supermajority (five of six votes of the executive council); at least five members must be present to vote and a unanimous vote is necessary if only five are present.

The stated purpose of the proposed reorganization is to improve community participation in order to make it more responsive to community needs, to reduce the role of advocacy and interest protection, and to focus the energy of the council on projects beneficial to fish, wildlife and community vitality and on education of the population.

CRMP Corner

By Jeffy Davis Marx

Broad community participation is essential to the CRMP process. This process has served the Scott Valley community well for seven years by bringing divergent interests together to find solutions to resource protection and management challenges within this watershed. Planning, developing plans and seeking funding for projects which restore and protect resources while serving the interests of landowners and the community has been the charge of the group. There has been success. The CRMP members, advisors, and cooperators have succeeded in perpetuating a vital process, however fluctuating it may have been in areas of agreement. Many plans have been written and many restoration projects have been implemented by the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District, an invaluable partner in the process. At this point, however, there is major burnout among participants. Yet, the work is not done, and a broad interest base is no longer participating in the process.

On November 16th, at the next meeting of the Scott River Watershed CRMP Council, the group will be considering a recommendation by an ad hoc CRMP committee established to find ways of revitalizing the watershed group process. It is the hope of that committee and of other members of the Council that changes in the process will alleviate some of the problems which have led to gridlock and burnout.

The Ad hoc Committee and the CRMP Council invite the public, as always, to attend and participate in their next meeting on November 16th at 7 p.m. at the United Methodist Church's Fellowship Hall in Etna.

The CRMP is also sponsoring a dinner in honor of all individuals who have participated in projects. Andrew Eller will be showing slides of the Fay Lane reach of the Riparian Restoration Program. All participants and their families are welcome. If you are a project participant and did not receive an invitation in the mail please come anyway. The dinner will take place on November 10th at 6 p.m. at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview.

Words from Webster

Do the right thing, Felice

The Scott Valley CRMP is falling apart, yet, the organization is looking at its brightest ray of hope.

On Tuesday the CRMP will vote whether to reorganize.

One of the biggest factors that has paralyzed the CRMP in the past is its consensus vote. This plan allowed any one individual to derail the objectives of the group with his sole vote. This left every individual voting member of the CRMP with unbelievable power. Some have used this power to advance their own agendas.

It is because of this that the CRMP is about to fold.

The CRMP is faced with a proposal to turn this around. It will consider changing the voting format from its present consensus vote to a super-majority vote. This would take away the individual power of any particular member. The

proposal also suggests that the CRMP executive committee be made up of private citizens rather than representatives of organizations.

The Catch-22 is this: In order to accomplish reorganizing the CRMP, members will have to vote on the proposal with a consensus vote. Every person voting will have to give up their own individual power and agenda in this particular vote Tuesday. They will have to seek what is best for the body as a whole, rather than their personal aims.

The only question that remains to be answered is whether a particular individual who has brought the CRMP to its knees will have the courage to do what is right in order to save the CRMP from extinction.

Felice Pace, if you are the man you claim to be, do the right thing.

-Daniel Webster

November 24, 1999

KFA kills CRMP

Continued from Page A1

already established for committees; and how sub-watershed groups could get involved.

Several long-standing CRMP members addressed Wright's concerns.

Ernie Wilkinson, a voting member, told Wright that committees such as the water committee had been developing an action plan for over one year.

Alan Kramer, another voting member, expressed that those in a sub-watershed such as the French Creek group, could become involved with any of the committees which would be of interest to them.

Garrett Plank, an observer, pressed Wright into quantifying how far off the proposal was from being acceptable to KFA. Wright expressed that she is very close to agreement on certain things and that she personally felt there were only a few issues that she was uncomfortable with.

Plank again, asked Wright to specifically state how far off the reorganizational committee's recommendations were.

She said, only by two percent and that it would probably take an "hour, maybe an hour and a half," to hash out.

Wilkinson moved to accept

the reorganizational committee's proposal, seconded by Kramer.

Mary Rochnich moved to amend the motion to keep the CRMP as is, pending discussion. Wilkinson did not accept the amendment, so it died.

Question was called and four members voted for the motion, Wright voted against.

After little discussion, Kramer moved to continue the CRMP in its present form, seconded by Wilkinson. Kramer, Hodas, Wilkinson and Rochnich voted against the motion. Wright voted for it. There was no consensus.

At which juncture Chairman Hodas announced to the group that the Scott River Watershed CRMP had just been dissolved.

Shunned, most everyone got up to leave, and Bryan said loud enough for everyone to hear, "Thank you Carol." Wright responded, "It's not my fault, we offered a friendly motion."

In the confusion, Kramer suggested that the group, formerly known as the Scott River CRMP take a 15 minute break and those who wished to continue to talk about creating a more positive working group to stay and begin the process. Upon returning to the meet-

ing room, Hodas was asked to moderate. But as the group began, Hodas asked Jeff Fowle to take over the meeting, because of his expertise in parliamentary procedure and knowledge of Roberts Rule's of Order.

Fowle expertly and systematically led the group through the procedure of creating a new organization.

It was decided to accept in concept the draft proposal from the restructuring committee presented to the defunct CRMP.

Those in attendance were concerned about the principles that would guide the group.

Carl Schwarzenberg suggested that what was needed was a statement of purpose.

Larry Toelle, a local constitutionist, suggested that the organization be fact based and abide by the constitution.

Bernard Dowling, a local rancher, said it should be a pro active group, rather than reacting to outside agencies/agendas.

Ayn Perry recommended that the process be voluntary.

The only suggestion Wright made was that a founding principal of the organization should be that the press should treat everyone fairly.

PIONEER PRESS

It was suggested that she reword the principle, as the organization can only dictate the actions of its members not individuals or businesses outside the group.

Wright then reworded her principle to, "we should demand that we are all treated fairly by the press."

A committee was designated to organize the principles into a mission statement.

Wilkinson moved to accept the name of Scott River Watershed Council as the name of the group. It was seconded by Rochnich and passed.

There are approximately 20 individuals that are volunteering to serve on the Scott River Watershed Council. They are: Wright, Warren Farnum, Plank, Toelle, Ken Manner, Jennifer Silvera, Perry, Lonie Bandy, Gary Black, Ric Costales, Kramer, Fowle, Carlo Finkle, Jeff Davis, Marx, Hodas, Wilkinson, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Schwarzenberg, Andrew Eller, Carolyn Finenel, Rochnich and Dowling.

The new organization will have its next meeting Tuesday, Dec. 14 at 7 p.m. at the Elton United Methodist Church.

Anyone who has an interest in activities involving the local watershed are invited.

KFA kills Scott River CRMP

Organization rebuilds from ashes

By Daniel Webster and
Liz Bowen

ETNA - The Scott River Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP) committee is dissolved.

Down from at one time 18 voting members to just seven, the CRMP has been seriously crippled throughout most of 1999. Many existing members believed the committee had lost significant community support.

Members of the Scott River Watershed CRMP met to consider recommendations from a reorganizational committee, which met throughout the past month.

Approximately 30 people were in attendance at the regular meeting Nov. 16, but only five were voting members.

First item on the agenda was the pro-

posed reorganization. Voting member Wing Hodas serving as acting chair for the night, called the meeting to order.

Each person was allowed three minutes for discussion.

The predominate views from nearly everyone in attendance was in support of the reorganization.

Scott Valley Rancher Mike Bryan voiced that he considered the CRMP was failing if it didn't reorganize. Others were in agreement.

A major issue addressed in the reorganization plan was regarding changing the present structure from a consensus vote, in which there must be a unanimous agreement in order to pass actions, to a super-majority in which only, say, five of six voting members would have to agree on a motion.

In addition, it was proposed that the members of the CRMP would act as an individual, instead of representing a particular organization.

In the past, for example, Felice Pace was the CRMP representative for the Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA) and Jeff Fowle represented the Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association.

The only individual at the meeting to voice concerns about the reorganization plan was Carol Wright, executive director of KFA, who was representing Pace at the meeting.

From the get-go, Wright expressed that she believed the plan was a "good start." That was it.

Wright's concerns involved issues such as whether there were goals and objectives

Continued on Page A8

Thinks headline was inaccurate

To the Editor:

I would like to thank you for attending the last CRMP meeting and for the "blow by blow" report on that meeting. Although I found the report to be detailed and accurate I am greatly dismayed that you apparently neglected to read the article yourself before selecting a headline. Had you read your article you would have noted that KFA, in fact, voted to maintain the CRMP in its current form pending further discussion of the reorganization structure.

Or could it be that the headline was intentionally misleading. Siam KFA! That should be good for circulation. Doesn't really matter what the facts are, just get people to buy the rag. Do you really aspire to be the hometown version of the National Inquirer?

Perhaps it is your opinion that KFA really did kill the CRMP. I must admit that the primary reason I read your paper is to keep up with people's opinions on the Expressions page. You are certainly entitled to your opinion, however, I believe your readers and the community are better served if you would restrain yourself to the editorial section for opinions. Think it over Mr. editor. Do you owe KFA an apology on this one.

My opinion is that one of the most important functions of the CRMP was to provide a forum for diverse ideas to be aired and discussed.

Unfortunately it is a fact of life that the more competition for resources generates friction. Even as some factions

would seek to restrict our local use of resources such as water, other factions are sure that we have surplus which should be exported to the population and ag centers to our south. If we are able to present a united front we will be able to maintain more control over our own lives. If we spend our energy bickering among ourselves the "Huns" will over run us. By listening to and addressing the needs, concerns, and fears of all of us I believe there is room for compromise in the allocation of resources. The CRMP as it was had lost its broad representation and so its diversity. Although there were only 5 voting members in attendance at the last CRMP meeting there were over 30 interested people present. This reinforces my belief that a new structure which will not only permit but encourage participation is critical.

On Dec. 14, 7 p.m. at the Etna Methodist Church the first meeting of the Scott River Watershed Council will convene. I hope to see a broad community representation in attendance. Daniel, I hope also to see you there, to express your views as a member of this community and also to keep the rest of the community informed. I do hope that your future reporting will be supportive of open discussion and less akin to lobbing grenades.

Thanks for the opportunity to rant and rave.

Alan Kramer
Etna

First meeting for Scott River Watershed Council slated

ETNA - The first meeting for the Scott River Watershed Council will be held next Tuesday, Dec. 14 at the United Methodist Church on Diggles Street.

The first items that will be decided are the mission statement and principles.

The Draft Statement of Principles or Mission Statement Committee has met and will propose the definition of the Scott River Watershed; principles; and goals; that the committee has drafted.

In draft #3, sent out by Jeff Davis Marx, the coordinator for the proposed new Scott River Watershed Council, outlines the basis of principles, which the group will operate under.

Definition of the Scott River Watershed is: All natural resources and human interests in the Scott River drainage (e.g. wildlife, fish, peoples, properties, economic systems, etc.)

Principles that the commit-

tee agreed to propose are as follows.

The primary focus of the Scott River Watershed Council's (SRWC) efforts will be on conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

In its activities, the SRWC will conduct itself with the utmost regard for:

1. Individual life, liberty and property; 2. Custom and culture of the area; 3. The intricate linkage of healthy communities and the natural environment.

There are five goals suggested by the draft committee.

The first is Inclusion: Promote the inclusion of all interested individuals within the watershed.

The second is Education: Emphasize widespread dissemination of accurate and current watershed resource information.

The third is Investigation: Actively investigate new and existing methodologies for local watershed study and improvement.

The fourth is Evaluation: Evaluate proposed and completed watershed projects.

The fifth is Action: Work in cooperation with property owners to develop sound and cost effective project proposals for resource conservation and enhancement.

Coordinator Davis Marx invites any one interested in the new watershed group and its process to attend the meeting. The group will meet the second Tuesday of each month.

For more information contact Davis Marx at 467-3708.

12/8

Scott River Watershed Council Report

By Jeffy Davis Marx

As many of you already are aware, the Scott River Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP) Council ended and arose from its own ashes in one evening to become the Scott River Watershed Council. I always felt that the acronym "CRMP" was awkward anyway. People always looked at me strangely when I used it, and it was difficult to explain.

Please read Alan Kramer's letter to the editor in the December 1, issue of the Pioneer Press, if you have not. His remarks on the headline in the November 24, front-page article about the last meeting are accurate. The article was relatively accurate, but the headline contradicted it.

The former watershed organization was ended by several people's votes. No one organization can be attributed fault for its end. In fact, it is remarkable that a process that requires so much effort on the part of community members adapted and transformed in order to continue. The Ad hoc Committee of the former CRMP should be credited for the hard work they did to come up with a process to better suit the community's needs.

So, let us look to the future and to solutions and not dwell on the past and blaming. That is what the Council is about - finding positive solutions to resource issues which are beneficial in all aspects to the community as a whole. Under the proposed new format, there is plenty of room for people to become involved on their own accounts and for as much or as little time and effort as they can afford. The December Watershed Council meeting will entail reviewing aspects of the newly proposed process and beginning the formation of committees or work groups, which will be the primary shakers and movers of the process as it is proposed.

If you would like more detailed information on the proposed structure of the group or an agenda, please call Jeffy Davis Marx at 467-3798. I will be glad to mail, email, fax or hand deliver the information you need.

I would encourage any person who has any interest in this watershed's resource issues and any related issue to come to the next meeting of the Watershed Council on Tuesday, December 14, at the Etna United Methodist Church at 7 p.m. The public is welcome to participate or just to listen.

12/2/99

Scott River Watershed Council Report

By Jeffy Davis Marx

As many of you already are aware, the Scott River Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP) Council ended and arose from its own ashes in one evening to become the Scott River Watershed Council. I always felt that the acronym "CRMP" was awkward anyway. People always looked at me strangely when I used it, and it was difficult to explain.

Please read Alan Kramer's letter to the editor in the December 1st issue of the Pioneer Press, if you have not. His remarks on the headline in the November 24th front-page article about the last meeting are accurate. The article was relatively accurate, but the headline contradicted it.

The former watershed organization was ended by several people's votes. No one organization can be attributed fault for its end. In fact, it is remarkable that a process that requires so much effort on the part of community members has adapted and transformed in order to continue. The Ad hoc Committee of the former CRMP should be credited for the hard work they did to come up with a process to better suit the community's needs.

So, let us look to the future and to solutions, and not dwell on the past and blaming. That is what the Council is about, finding positive solutions to resource issues which are beneficial in all aspects to the community as a whole. Under the proposed new format, there is plenty of room for people to become involved on their own accounts and for as much or as little time and effort as they can afford. The December Watershed Council meeting will entail reviewing aspects of the newly proposed process and beginning the formation of the committees or work groups, which will be the primary shakers and movers of the process as it is proposed.

If you would like more detailed information on the proposed structure of the group or an agenda, please call Jeffy Davis Marx at 467-3798. I will be glad to mail, email, fax or hand deliver the information you need.

I would encourage any person who has any interest in this watershed's resource issues and any related issue to come to the next meeting of the Watershed Council on Tuesday, December 14th, at the Etna United Methodist Church at 7:00 pm. The public is welcome to participate or just to listen.

Public Service Announcement (Revised)

December 20, 1999

To: Daniel Webster, Pioneer Press, 468-5356
From: Jennifer Davis Marx, Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator,
Phone: 467-3798
Fax: 467-3728

Daniel,

Please replace the last article I sent you on Friday, December 17th, with this one. I did not include some of the information. It is for publication on January 5th and January 12th. Perhaps you could put it on your calendar also.

Thanks, Jeffy

Ranch Water Quality Workshops

Another session of the Ranch and Watershed Planning workshop will be held on **the last two Monday evenings in January (January 24th and 31st) and on a third evening to be decided** by the participants. It will take place at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenvien at 7 p.m. The instructors are Dr. Dan Drake, UC Extension, and Randy Seelbrede, Natural Resource Conservation Service. Because the instructors need to prepare aerial photos and soil maps for participants, they **need to have signed up for the course by January 17th**. There is a **fee of \$30** charged to pay for materials.

The course is useful to anyone owning property of any acreage although it is directed mostly toward those have some land use activity on their property.

The Workshop guides participants through an inventory and assessment of the ranching operations. Six key areas are addressed: Goals for natural resources, water quality and quality of life; facilities location, physical inventory, buildings, roads, corrals/feedlots, pastures/fields, water development, structures; natural resource inventory (climate, vegetation, soils, hydrology, wildlife, watershed, streams and creeks); livestock/crop operations (animal inventory, grazing systems, forage feed resources); ranch water quality assessment (erosion and sediment sources, riparian stream conditions, nutrients and pathogens); management strategy (conservation practices, grazing/stocking alternatives, financial incentives); monitoring (historic records/photos, trends, photo-point monitoring, grazing and instream monitoring).

This is a voluntary program supported by California Cattleman's Association, California Association of Resource Conservation Districts, California Farm Bureau Federation, California Wool Growers Association, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards. The Plan provides for a voluntary and cooperative approach to complying with the requirements of the Clean Water Act and Coastal Zone Management Act. Such a conservation plan may also be useful in avoiding other regulatory actions related to fisheries. The greatest benefit is to the participant, whose operation can potentially benefit from an increased, over-all efficiency due to the increased forethought provided by the planning process.

Please call Jennifer Davis Marx, 467-3798, or Randy Seelbrede, NRCS, 842-6121 for more information. Call the Siskiyou RCD office (467-3975) to sign up for the class.

1/7/00

Scott River Watershed Council Report

By Jeffy Davis Marx

All the folks who attended the Council meeting on December 14th are to be commended for their teamwork and intelligence in the effort to get the process rolling again. The meeting was well-attended, dynamic and highly participatory.


It is difficult to decide what to keep and what to reject of the previous and, at once, parallel, watershed group's efforts. After all, many watershed restoration and protection projects which were funded as a result of the CRMP's efforts are now either completed, in progress, or have just been funded. What of the previous effort do we need to do better? What worked so well that we need to retain it? We do not need to reinvent the wheel, but it can use some refinements (what can't?). Maybe some ball-bearings would improve the functioning.

The Council has requested that Sari Sommarstrom, who was the original CRMP Coordinator, report to them on a study recently written by her and by Charles Huntington. The study evaluated selected watershed groups in the Pacific Northwest and Northern California according to their effectiveness in developing and implementing restoration plans, their processes, and their conservation effectiveness. All of these elements are difficult to measure by any single set of standards, as every watershed and its community are different, but I am sure that Sari can offer some tidbits of wisdom gathered from other groups' collective experiences. The Scott River Watershed Council has requested that, on the basis of her study, she make recommendations to this group. The Council is presently focused on setting up the group process, although recommendations in other areas such as planning and project implementation are welcome.

Many local citizens have signed up for participation on the committees, but more are always welcome. Emphasis is on an open process, in which all interested parties are welcome. If you have interest in conservation as it pertains to Water, Fish, Land Use, Monitoring, Education or Community Outreach please feel free to come to the January meeting and sign up for one of these committees or simply call Jeffy Davis Marx at 467-3798. You do not need to attend big ol' meetings in order to participate in the Watershed Council process.

For those of you who participate in your own subwatershed group, such as, Shackleford/Mill, Moffett, French Creek, Tailings, or Sugar Creek should make sure that someone from your group is representing your interests in one or more of the Council's committees.

The next Scott River Watershed Council meeting will be held at the Fort Jones Community Center on Tuesday, January 18, 2000 at 7 pm. The public is invited and encouraged to attend.



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027; Phone: (530) 467-3798
FAX: (530) 467-3728; E-mail: jeffvdm@sisqtel.net
Website: www.sisqtel.net/~sisqrcd/

May 9, 2000

Dear Scott River Watershed Council Member,

Yes, as Gareth Plank so appropriately let a resident know in a recent Council meeting, everyone in the watershed is a member. That does not mean that everyone will participate in the process but that everyone is welcome to participate.

This is a letter to inform you of an opportunity to consult with a person very experienced in the "pros and cons", "if's" and "how's" of landowners monitoring their own water quality. Ken Tate, Watershed Specialist, from UC Extension, Davis has been working with ranchers, the California Farm Bureau Federation and the Regional Water Quality Board in implementing water quality surveys and sediment inventories that landowners can do themselves. The collected data is the landowner's. The advantage to this is that when the Regional Water Quality Board sets sediment and other water quality limits on the Scott River watershed, you and I will know whether or not they are reasonable. The best defense against unreasonable regulation is to have facts at your disposal which show the regulation to be unreasonable.

Some of you may have seen Ken Tate at the Siskiyou County Grower's Seminar this spring.

Please take a look at the following announcement. You are encouraged and welcome to participate in any portion of the day's events, even just the free dinner if you so choose.

Sincerely,

Jeffy Davis Marx, Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator

Tuesday, May 30, 2000

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 1:00 pm | Ken Tate will meet with interested Moffett Creek landowners at the corner of Hwy 3 and Moffett Creek Road to take a look at the watershed and to discuss their interests in monitoring their own water quality. |
| 6:00 pm | Spaghetti dinner at Scott Valley Grange, Greenview, free to Scott River watershed residents. Scott River Watershed Council active members will contribute salads and desserts. |
| 7:00 pm | Ken Tate will speak on landowner water quality monitoring. He wishes a dialogue, not just a one-way presentation. Please come with questions, no matter how probing. |

12 Local News

A new twist on the 'roadless' issue

KLAMATH RIVER - Ray Miller of Seiad decided to conduct his own poll about the roadless issue.

After hearing rhetoric from the upper management of the USFS (Washington D.C.) echoed by environmental preservations, Miller decided

to see just what residents along Klamath River thought of the expansion of roadless areas in what is supposed to be the public's land.

Miller said he was surprised at the overwhelming response against the roadless proposal.

New water regs

Continued from Page 1

budget" for the Scott River. That pollution budget will deal with a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for sediment that will be allowed by the government in streams and rivers.

Davis-Marx encourages land owners to learn how to record sediment and temperature from the effects of agricultural and road operations.

"Would you rather tell them or have them tell you what the reality is?" says Davis-Marx.

According to the regional board's schedule, the TMDL for the Scott River will be set in 2005. That gives the people in the Scott watershed time to gather their own data, so that arbitrary limits taken from other very different systems are not used to set limits on the Scott.

TMDL's are a result of the

federal Clean Water Act of 1972. The law was aimed at controlling water pollution to protect what it calls "beneficial uses." The law was passed when many rivers were so dirty that they caught fire in the East and Midwest.

At first regulators focused on the most obvious sources of pollution. Then regulators turned attention to "non-point sources," which has become sediment and an increase in water temperature from operational practices on land.

A lawsuit brought by the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association and 12 other groups forced the U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency to set limits on how much pollution could be discharged into streams.

For more information contact Davis-Marx at 467-3798.

Gearing up for wildfire s

FORT JONES - A California firefighter will be knocking on home owners' doors asking to do a wildfire clearance inspection starting with the Scott River Road area.

"We want to work with home owners and assist them in protecting their property from wildfire destruction," said Doug Blangsted, Battalion Chief for the Scott Valley Division of the California Department of Forestry and Fire (CDF).

Fire season in Scott Valley will officially start on June 12, when the first engine will

Neighborhood Watch need you

ETNA - The Etna Neighborhood Watch, which covers Greenville to Callahan and all areas inbetween, seeks a cooperative effort with patrol volunteers to serve as the "eyes and ears" of the Etna Police Department and the Siskiyou County Sheriff's Department. If interested in helping call 467-3455 or 467-5425.

New pastors

Continued from Page 1

summer months offering exciting activities for teens.

Bill Birch recently was appointed as full-time pastor of the Scott Valley Berean Church, based in Etna. For 21 years, he has worked with Pastor Wendell Seward. The first four years, Birch served the church as Youth Pastor. He also organized youth programs at the Kidder Creek Orchard Camps and started the backpacking activities.

Birch operated Young Life clubs at both the Etna and Fort Jones high schools.

always welcome.

Mike Thackeray became Bishop of the Etna Ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints last July 25. He chose John McGonigal and Lee Pierce as his counselors.

Clergy is not paid in the LDS church and so Bishop Thackeray also works as a mechanic and cooling technician.

"I am a home-grown country boy," says Bishop Thackeray, who grew up on a dairy in Scott Valley learning the value of hard work.

Bishop Thackeray and his wife, Tammy, live in Etna.

children.

On Sunday mornings a 10:15, Sunday School classes are held for ages 12 and older. Coinciding with the Sunday School is the Primal classes for youth 11 and younger.

The women's organization called Relief Society meets 11:10 as does the Priesthood for all men.

The teenage "Young Men" program works in conjunction with the Boy Scouts America program. That group meets on Wednesday night at 6:30 p.m.

A weekly program held for teenaged Young Women also held on Wednesday

Jefferson's Official Newspaper

Serving Northern Siskiyou County

Wednesday, May 24, 2000

50 Cents



eg won the sectional track meet in pole vaulting last Saturday.

winners in track sectionals

na High took the third place medal in pole vaulting. Jon Dias earned a second in discus and hopes to break his school record of 126 feet and five inches in the North State Finals this Friday. Dylan Dunlap was sixth in the discus. Craig Hicks placed second in the high jump. For the varsity girls Etna team, Kelli Nash was second in the 3200; fifth in the 1600; and fifth in the 4x1. Sandy Hansen was fifth in

one girl tripped, the whole pack almost went crashing down.

The hot 90 degree weather was a factor for Etna's team, who have come from two weeks of a cold, rainy mountain climate.

Eric LaBriere had a great day with two wins. One was in the 400m and the other was in the 1600m. He came in eighth in the 4x1.

"Eric walked away with the 400 race," said Swezey, "when he left the start he flew

New water regs may hurt land owners

- Land owners have a chance to learn how to protect their land and water from possible future regulations.

GREENVIEW - On Tuesday, May 30, Ken Tate, a watershed specialist, will share his knowledge about monitoring water quality with land owners.

A free spaghetti dinner will be held at 6 p.m. at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview, and the "dialogue" with Tate will begin at 7 p.m.

Local property owners with streams or rivers running through their land, will likely want to protect themselves from future, unnecessary government regulations.

Tate, who is with the University of California Agricultural Extension in Davis, explains monitoring for sediment in streams, tracking water temperatures, and recording the data gathered.

As part of the educational workshops presented by the Scott River Watershed Council (SRWC), coordinator Jeffy Davis-Marx invites all property owners to attend.


In 2005, the North Coast Water Quality Control Board will prepare a "pollution

Continued on Page 12



Juniper Field Tour
March 8, 2000

- 1 Ray Hall
- 2 Bernard Wenzel
- 3 Garth Mark
- 4 John Menke
- 5 Jennifer Bierce
- 6 Doug Bionigster
- 7 ~~Warren Farnsworth~~
- 8 ~~Ric Casella~~
- 9 Stanley Jordan
- 10 Eric Wilkinson
- 11 Carolyn Amintre
- 12 Tom Hansen
- 13 Carl Reifenstein
- 14 Sean P. MacLure
- 15 Sharon Larive
- 16 George Thackery
- 17 Gary Sisk
- 18 Danielle Gugliuz
- 19 Dr. Richard Miller



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

AGENDA

March 8, 2000

JUNIPER WORKSHOP & FIELD TOUR

Sponsored by the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District
and the Scott River Watershed Council

Greenview Grange Hall, Greenview California

- 8:30 a.m. Registration
- 9:00 Welcome & Introductions by Carolyn Pimentel,
Siskiyou RCD District Manager
- 9:05 Lecture & Slide Presentation by Dr. Richard Miller, Ph.D. Professor of
Rangeland Resources at OSU, stationed at the Eastern Oregon Agricultural
Research Center in Burns, Oregon. Dr. Miller has been with OSU for 23 years
and worked with juniper for the past 20 years. His primary work area has been
in the John Day area to south of Alturas in California, and to the east into
northwest Nevada. His work relates to juniper expansion, cutting, fire, old
growth woodlands, wildlife habitat, and overstory/ understory relationships.
He received his BS at Humboldt State, MS at OSU, and Ph.D. at New Mexico.
- 11:00 Field Tour to Site # 1 – Moffett Creek
- 12:30 p.m. Sack Lunch in Field
- 1:00 Field Tour to Site # 2 – McConaughy Gulch
- 2:30 Field Tour to Site # 3 – Plank Ranch
- 4:30 Tour End - Car Pool back to Greenview Grange Hall

tainment.

One of the first celebrations was held by Cub Scout Pack 37 of Mount Shasta on Feb. 12. 75 Cubs and their families attended the party. Dinner included chicken, meat

in on
sador
Gail
468-

the

en.
ds are
hired-
e and
ed fee

of age
Aid to

of age
of the
mthly
s does
lows
erson,
\$1,156

harged
Armed
meet-
rent or

Cub Outrigger canoe and regatta team.

Zac Taylor of Mount Shasta was ceremoniously presented with the Arrow of Light, Cub Scouting's highest youth achievement.

RCD field trip slated in Scott Valley

SCOTT VALLEY - Dr. Richard Miller of Oregon State University's Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Station in Burns, Ore., will be conducting a field trip to discuss issues or concerns related to junipers such as separating out old growth from young stands, a perception that many of the woodlands of today existed prior to Euro-Asian settlement, wildlife habitat, and poor management decisions that can allow range conditions to decline. Other topics will depend on site-specific issues and questions from the participants. This field trip is sponsored by the Scott River Watershed Council and the Siskiyou RCD.

The field trip will begin at 9 a.m. at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview.

In case of very inclement weather, the field trip portion will be cut short and most of the session will be held in the Scott Valley Grange Hall in Greenview.

com
Cres
Gro
be e
the
of a
red
of
from
be i
be b
2001
seas
want
won
effe
scrib
fire
para
plan
bein
plan
will
break
says
flect
port
will
the p
ation
desig
addi
appl
Pres
ment
with
years
tion
ment
Yes
to co
pose
have
pleas
(530)

John W. Davis
page 12
J. W. Davis



Tuesday, February 22, 2000

LOCAL

Grant Writing Seminar set for Wednesday

YREKA — A "How-to Write Grants" seminar will be taught by Carla Alexander and Doreen Bradshaw of the Grant and Resource Center of Northern California on Feb. 23 at the Siskiyou County Economic Development Council office in Yreka from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Participation cost is \$25 per person and limited to 20 people. To assure participation payment must be received promptly. Checks should be made out to the Siskiyou County Economic Development (EDC).

For more information call 842-1638 or e-mail

for those interested in obtaining training and completion certification for non-medical caregiving.

This course will cover aspects of working with the elderly including: physical and emotional aspects of aging; Alzheimer's & Dementia; communication skills, emergency situations, elder abuse, and job opportunities.

This 12-hour course will be offered on Wednesday through

Friday from 8:30 a.m. 12:30 p.m. at Alta Vista Manor, 625 Mariorie Street, 219, Mt. Shasta. Call Susanne Scofield at 229-0878 or Carol Jones at 4595556 to register. Class size is limited.

Helsaple speaks at writer's club meeting

YREKA — Brian Helsaple of Seiad Valley will be the guest speaker of the Siskiyou Writers Club on Thursday evening at Denny's Restaurant in Yreka.

Author of "Seiad Valley Tales and Tailings" (available at The Book Store in Yreka), "Pixiewater," a children's book with audio tape and sound effects, and a work in progress.

For more information, call Jeanie Griggs at 467-3226

Juniper management is topic of field trip

YREKA — Dr. Richard Miller of Oregon State University's Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Station in Burns, Ore., will be conducting a field trip March 8 to discuss issues or concerns related to junipers.

This field trip is sponsored by the Scott River Watershed Council and the Siskiyou RCD.

The field trip begin at 9 a.m. at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview, with a half-hour introductory talk. Those participating will then go to several sites throughout the day.

There is no cost for the participants and a good lunch will be provided. Reserve a spot by calling the Siskiyou Resource Conservation District office in Etna at 467-3975 before March 1.

In case of very inclement weather, the field trip portion will be cut short and most of the session will be held in the Scott Valley Grange Hall in Greenview.

application process, headquartered in Boise, Idaho.

This application process will be used for wide variety of temporary jobs such as firefighting, timber marking, surveying, recreation, etc. The new process will speed up the hiring procedure, allow applicants to submit applications year-round, and enable them to apply to as many as nine different locations.

To obtain the necessary information and employment application forms, call toll free (877) 813-3476.

Applications are also available on the internet at: www.fws.gov/people/employ.

Fair board looking for next fair theme

*The Ruddiman Family:
Lindy, Bill & Betty*
*on behalf of Bill Ruddiman thank all those
who sent condolences, cared for him & were.*

IV

A. Civil Behavior

Possible Solutions:

- 1 • person leave on their own, cool off and apologize,
- 2 • member takes a break and does not come to meetings for a few months and lets someone else represent the organization,
- 3 • members police each other, member organizations police themselves and keep their members under control,
- 4 • the CRMP meeting stops and everyone goes home,
- 5 • CRMP stops having meetings and dissolves
- 6 • Rules - People will not use profanity, raise voice, throw things, etc.
- 7 •

B. Structure and Membership

Possible Solutions:

- 1 • Continue with same structure using a regular outside facilitator
- 2 • Reduce size of CRMP to 12 voting members or less
- 3 • Eliminate groups not participating, invite other groups to participate
- 4 • Restructure the executive committee and give it voting power, Four main subcommittees involve people in an advisory capacity only
- 5 • Reduce the control of the executive committee by clarifying role and bringing all things to the full CRMP
- 6 • Reduce the role of CRMP staff on the executive committee and at meetings so power and initiative will be with the CRMP members
- 7 • Elect a CRMP member as the secretary
- 8 •
- 9 •

C. Focus, Process and Procedures

Possible Solutions:

- 1 • vote and adopt the by-laws
- 2 • develop a MOU or MOA between the CRMP and the RCD
- 3 • Agree on the procedure and assign someone to watchdog and remind the group.
- 4 • Hire a facilitator to keep the group on track.
- 5 • Revisit the rules and adopt them in a formal ceremony where each member signs a copy of the rules and statement that he/she will try his/her best to follow the rules. Read these rules at every meeting.
- 6 • Make decisions by a majority or some other designated % of voting members
- 7 • Use consensus but it takes 2 votes to block a decision
- 8 • Have CRMP be educational only, let RCD be the "decision maker"
- 9 • Way to deal w/ conflict
- 10 •

D. Relationship with RCD

Possible Solutions:

- 1 • Develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the RCD to clarify roles and procedures
- 2 •

E. Deep unresolved issues

Possible Solutions:

- 1 •
- 2 •

F. Trust

Possible Solutions:

- 1 • Rename the CRMP and use the name change to mark a fresh start. (name example: Scott River Watershed Council)

Tonight's agenda:

- General Opinions from the survey
- Given that the CRMP is working under
- Action to be taken

General Opinions from the survey

In general people agree that the CRMP:

- is valuable, making a difference for landowners, fish, and the community
- should continue
- should restructure
- should restructure the voting membership
- should lower the number of voting members
- should add other organizations
- should remove organizations that do not participate
- staff follows directions given by the CRMP
- executive committee functions OK, could restructure if the CRMP is restructured
- is given the opportunity to review and agree on proposals
- if there are changes in funded proposals, the CRMP is not always informed
- civil behavior is a must and something should be done when behavior is inappropriate
- most people are worn out from working with Felice and want to see a new representative from KFA

*Write letter to ask if want to
to introduce -*

*Process of
in community
CRMP of
project chair*

- *It's a bit consensus works - it says not working*
- *Person being paid should not be voting member*
- *by organization*
-
-
-

Given that the CRMP is working under

- CRMP is a consensus group, so all members need to contribute and there must be agreement to take action
- Each organization has the right to send the representative of their choice
- To restructure everyone must agree
- everyone is not going to agree to have Felice ^{leave} ~~from~~ the CRMP

- *Group of volunteers*
- *RCD receives funding*
- *Focus on needs -*

Action to be taken. (So what can be done???)

- change the structure
- change or control the process
- change or control the personalities
- change or control behavior
- recommit and decide to respect and trust one another, focus on agreement and stop fighting where there is not

Section Four - Options to think about

A. Civil Behavior

Possible Solutions: when a person does any of the above they leave on their own, cool off and apologize, member takes a break and does not come to meetings for a few months and lets someone else represent the organization, member resigns, members police each other, member organizations police themselves and keep their members under control, the CRMP meeting stops and everyone goes home, CRMP stops having meetings and dissolves

B. Structure and Membership

Possible Solutions:

Continue with same structure using a regular outside facilitator

Reduce size of CRMP to 12 voting members or less

Eliminate groups not participating, invite other groups to participate

Restructure the executive committee and give it voting power, Four main subcommittees involve people in an advisory capacity only

Reduce the control of the executive committee by clarifying role and bringing all things to the full CRMP

Reduce the role of CRMP staff on the executive committee and at meetings so power and initiative will be with the CRMP members

Elect a CRMP member as the secretary

C. Focus, Process and Procedures

Possible Solutions:

Agree on the procedure and assign someone to watchdog and remind the group.

Hire a facilitator to keep the group on track.

Revisit the rules and adopt them in a formal ceremony where each member signs a copy of the rules and statement that he/she will try his/her best to follow the rules. Read these rules at every meeting.

Make decisions by a majority or some other designated % of voting members

Use consensus but it takes 2 votes to block a decision

Have CRMP be educational only, let RCD be the "decision maker"

D. Relationship with RCD

Possible Solutions:

Develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the RCD to clarify roles and procedures

E. Deep unresolved issues

Possible Solutions:

F. Trust

Possible Solutions:

Rename the CRMP and use the name change to mark a fresh start. (name example: Scott River Watershed Council)

Do you consider any of the following as issues causing conflict for CRMP?

59. yes no The process for monitoring project progress. Is CRMP able to evaluate the impact of projects that are being worked on or completed?

60. yes no Progress toward meeting objectives set out in plans

61. yes no Progress toward developing and adopting a "restoration plan."

62. yes no Progress toward developing and adopting a "project prioritization plan."

63. yes no Alternative stock water projects being provided where there was no possibility of achieving the objective of getting water out of ditches and into the river in the Fall, after irrigation

F. Trust

64. What can be done about politicking behind the scenes?

65. What can be done about people talking behind other people's backs?

66. Have the By-Laws been formally approved? If so have there been violations Article X, special rules number 1, 3, 9, 10, 13? If so what should be done about the violations?

67. Should or can anything be done when member organizations try to make their own deals with agencies/groups?

68. Are you willing to understand others' positions?

69. KFA needs to be part of CRMP but Felice is a problem because of what he represents to landowners.

D. Relationship with RCD (from Deep unresolved issues)

43. What is the CRMP's role? education and discussion,
advisory/recommendation or making the decisions? please circle or explain.

44. Is it ok for the RCD to change CRMP projects and budgets without
consulting the CRMP? yes no

45. Should the CRMP coordinator be supervised by the CRMP or the RCD or both?

46. Is it ok for the RCD to represent the CRMP at meetings? yes no
if so why and under what authority?

47. Is it ok for the RCD to padded budgets and use money for ways that are
not connected to an intended project? yes no

48. What % should the RCD charged for administrative costs in proposed CRMP
projects?

49. Has the RCD misrepresented the CRMP in secret meetings with NMFS? Did
the RCD claim that the CRMP was doing all that is needed for the fish and
therefore the Scott Valley watershed should be "exempted" from the Endanger
Species Act (ESA)?

C. Structure and Membership

29. Why are some members not participating?

30. Would you like to see the CRMP make changes in the voting membership?

30a. lower the number to 8-12 voting members? yes
no

30b. remove members organizations that do not participate?
yes no

30c. add other organizations that are interested? yes
no

30d. add more on the ground members? yes no

31. What would happen if KFA were not a part of the CRMP?

32. Would it be better for you, if Felice was not the KFA representative?
yes no

33. Is it good for the CRMP, a community group of volunteers, to have
representatives that are paid by their organization to advocate/lobby?
yes no

34. Would you like to see changes in the structure of the executive
committee? yes no

35. Would you like to see changes in the function of the executive
committee? yes no

36. Do you think the executive committee has power beyond what the CRMP
intended it to have? yes no

37. Do you think the executive committee control the agenda of CRMP?
yes no

38. Do you think the executive committee keep certain issues from getting
on the CRMP agenda? yes no

39. Should the executive committee take action (or be a driving force,
when not directed by the CRMP? yes no

40. Should the executive committee take action if they decide that a member
has violated a CRMP rule? yes no

41. Would you like to see changes in the structure of the subcommittees?
yes no

42. Would you like to see changes in the function of the subcommittees?
yes no

Section Two - Needs/Issues

A. Civil Behavior

17. What do you want to have happen when someone yells, uses profanity or obscenities, throws things, threatens or is physically aggressive at CRMP meetings/activities?

18. It was stated by many at the last special meeting that KFA needs to participate but Felice is a problem because he does not control his own behavior. What do you want to do about this?

B. Focus, Process and Procedures

19. Is the CRMP focused where there is agreement and not acting until there is agreement?

20. Is the CRMP focused on common goals?

21. Is the CRMP staff following CRMP directions or formulating proposals as directed by the CRMP?

22. Is the CRMP given opportunity to review and agree on all proposals?

23. Is the CRMP given opportunity to review and agree on all changes to proposals after a proposal is funded?

24. Is the CRMP given opportunity to review and agree on all financial changes made after a proposal is funded?

Other issues:

25. Tasks not completed by volunteers

26. All members follow the rules, no special exceptions

27. Phone calls not getting returned or not showing for meetings

28. CRMP Alternative Stock Water Projects being provided without CRMP approval
????

1. Is the work of the CRMP valuable? yes or no Please explain.
2. Is the CRMP making a positive difference for landowners? yes
no Please explain.
3. Is the CRMP making a positive difference for fish? yes
no Please explain.
4. Is CRMP a positive force in educating the community? yes
no Please explain.
5. Is CRMP a positive force for salmon restoration? yes no
Please explain.
6. Is the CRMP a positive force for community unity? yes no
Please explain.
7. Do you want to be a member of CRMP?
8. Why are you personally coming to CRMP or why not?
9. What do you want to accomplish by participating in CRMP?
10. Do you come to CRMP to change the present situation or to keep the status quo? Please explain.
11. Do you come to CRMP because of a fear or threat of losing something?
yes no
If yes, what?
12. If you could think of a hidden agenda for yourself, what would it be?
13. Do you believe the CRMP should continue? yes no
Please explain.
14. Do you think the CRMP would make more progress if it restructured its membership?
yes no Please explain.
15. Do you think the CRMP would make more progress if it did not use a consensus process? yes no Please explain.
16. Do you think the CRMP should be dissolved? yes no
Please explain.

cc: Freda Walker

FROM: Freda Walker, Facilitator of Special Meeting of May 1999

RE: The next step-homework-the next meeting

As agreed, I have put together a bit of homework for those of you that will take on the job. Plus, I am wondering, did any of you make a call or contact with someone else in CRMP and have a dialogue?

After organizing and typing out the information and issues, I realized all the items listed could be overwhelming for one piece of homework and one more meeting. So I have provided all the information for consideration, and have divided the homework into sections. I may or may not have everything or in the section you think it belongs. I understand that each person will probably not respond to all items listed. Please read everything and then complete those sections or questions that are important to you.

To prepare for the next meeting that is scheduled for Wed. 2 June 1999 at 7:00pm at the Etna Methodist Church, this homework needs to be completed and turned in by the 1 June 1999 by 9:00am. If I am able to compile the information before the meeting, then the CRMP can look at what the group is thinking, without having to hear from each person. That way the group can focus on solutions and action. Please mail your responses to Freda Walker, 5809 French Creek Rd., Etna, CA 96027 or bring a copy by my office located at Bob's Ranch House, north end, east side (Steve's Ice Cream is now the office where I work).


I am the one who will review your answers and compile the information. CRMP or RCD staff or other members will not see your answers. If you want to share your answers that will be up to you.

Section One is focused on General, Why/What Questions?. Section Two - Needs/Issues (this reminds me of a basic principle about consensus groups: "Focus on the needs not on positions or people"). Section Three is a listing of options, so members can ponder, predict and evaluate outcomes.

Homework Action:

1. read all information
2. answer the items that are important to you or you want to answer
remember your answers will remain anonymous
3. return your answers by June 1 at 9:00a.m.
4. come to the June 2 special meeting at 7:00p.m., Etna Methodist Church

IV



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Phone: (530) 467-3798 FAX: (530) 467-3728
E-mail: jeffvdm@sisqtel.net
Website: www.sisqtel.net/~sisqcd/

March 24, 2000

Ron Iverson
Project Leader
Klamath Basin Fisheries Task Force
P. O. Box 1006
Yreka, CA 96097

Dear Mr. Iverson,

The Scott River Watershed Council asked me to express their gratitude for presentation at their February 21st meeting. A big thank you for the effort it takes to drive long distances late at night. This letter of appreciation certainly would have arrived sooner, had I not left immediately for Panama for three weeks following that meeting. Please pardon the delay.

In addition to expressing their gratitude, the Executive Council would appreciate receiving any further specific information from Task Force that would assure that Task Force goals and objectives are being addressed by the planning efforts of the Scott River Watershed Council.

A footnote: The Watershed Council has adopted a strategy for planning which, so far, includes the use of a "planning cookbook", a compilation of all and any information related to the Scott River watershed resources. Contributions of this material are open to the public. I, or someone whom I appoint, will be the archivist in charge of receiving and organizing the materials. The "cookbook" is a three-ring binder with categories that correspond to the outline developed by the subbasins and the Technical Work Group several years ago. References will be made to documents too large to include in the binder, and they will be kept in the Siskiyou RCD office. It is anticipated that the collection process will take up to a year. The compilation of that material into a Strategic and Action Plan will follow. I will be seeking funding this year for that planning effort because professional planning help will be of great value at that point. As I will be doing a slide presentation and tour for the Technical Work Group on April 5 & 6, 2000 if we are sticking with our schedule, any input from the TWG will be most welcome.

Thank you again for your contribution to the Scott River Watershed Council's efforts. We look forward to a continued open dialogue.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Davis Marx, Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator
cc: Laurie Simons

*Materials provided to Jim DePree
to defend SWRC w/ KFA letter
coming up at TF meeting*
Fax Cover Page

To: Siskiyou County Planning Dept.

(530) 842-8211

Attn: Jim DePree

Number of Pages Including Cover Page: ~~2~~ 10

From: Jennifer (Jeffy) Davis Marx
Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator
P. O. Box 85
Etna, CA 96027

Phone: (530) 467-3798
Fax: (530) 467-3728
E-mail: jeffydms@sisqtel.net

Message

Date: 2/7/00

Hello Jim,

If you have any questions on any of this, please let me know.

Attached:

- ◆ KFA letter to Task Force regarding the Scott River Watershed Council
- ◆ Jeffy's perspective issue by issue
- ◆ Letter from Ric Costales to Ron Iverson, USFWS
- ◆ Letter from Wing Hodas to KFA

Jeffy

February 4, 2000

Dear Jim,

Thank you for consenting to respond if the KFA letter to the Task Force about the Scott River Watershed Council is brought up on the agenda.

I will simply list my answers/concerns regarding this letter. I agree for the most part with both Ric Costales' letter and Wing Hodas' letter on the issue. These are two very diverse people on the Council. Their letters, therefore, make a pretty good case by themselves.

Jeffy


My points:

- ◆ KFA if they have concerns with the Council process should be in attendance and dealing with them within the group context.
- ◆ I do not know what "plan" we should present in order to obtain funding. A description of the process in the making is described in as much detail as is available in my final report from the last funding cycle submitted to USFWS in January. Anyone who has a concern is welcome to such a report.
- ◆ Concern #1: Most people did not feel that an MOU, as such, was necessary for the Council/RCD relationship. A description of that relationship has been approved in the past by the RCD. Another, slightly more detailed, description has recently been approved by the RCD and will go to the Council for a review and action.
- ◆ Concern # 2: It has been decided that agency people will participate in an advisory capacity. Most of them had already told us that their participation was limited to that role anyway.
- ◆ Concern # 3: The number of standing committees is presently prescribed as six. The group is considering a proposal to work for consensus and use the super-majority vote as a fall-back measure for decisions. KFA should have been more concerned about a change in the decision-making process when they were consistently blocking measures which were otherwise accepted by the rest of the former CRMP.

An agency person (who previously headed up the Technical Committee) and an RCD staff member will recommend the Technical Committee members to the Executive Council. The desire is to have a mixture of agency and community members with expertise in a variety of areas and sciences.

- ◆ Concern #4: KFA has not participated in any of the subbasin groups, and has no room to make a judgement on their capabilities or outcomes. Some of the groups have been active and have done some great things. There is not a subbasin landowner group in every tributary and some are not very active. Does KFA want to get them all started? Might their not be a geographical competition for funds that might result? The subbasin groups are invited to participate and to report on their activities.

- ♦ The irony of KFA complaining about the “refusal” of the CRMP or Council to come forward with a subbasin plan is astonishing. The main blockage to that effort was their multiple refusals to accept the revision of the Fall Flows Action Plan although they knew that it was a major step toward working on the subbasin plan. We have submitted several proposals for the funding of such a plan, all of which have been refused. In addition, the Coordinator, in conjunction with the Technical Work Group, Humboldt State professors and graduate students, and community members have been and are presently working on necessary pieces of such a plan.



KLAMATH FOREST ALLIANCE

1/3/2000

Mr. Ron Iverson
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
PO Box 1006
Yreka, California 96097

Dear Mr. Iverson:

We are in receipt of your email responding to our concerns regarding the dissolution of the Scott River CRMP and formation of the Scott River Watershed Council. You conclude the reorganization has no effect on the terms of the cooperative agreement between the Siskiyou RCD and USFWS for operation of the Scott River Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan. We feel the language of the original cooperative agreement makes it clear that the contract is for operation of a specific CRMP open to participation by all INTERESTS and by AGENCIES with specific stated purposes including building "cooperative relationships between various State and Federal agencies, special interest groups, and private landowners through the CRMP process."

This objective is nonexistent in the new principals set forth by the reorganizing participants. This group is very clear that only "individuals" may participate - no agencies, no organizations which seek to represent the public interest, and no tribes. In fact, none of the program objectives upon which the agreement was based and money granted is clearly stated in the draft statement of principles and goals of the newly created Scott River Watershed Council.

Having stated the above, we support your decision not to pull or freeze the current grant which is nearly completed. Rather, we concur that the Siskiyou RCD and the Scott River Watershed Council (SRWC) must be required to present a plan to the Klamath Fisheries Task Force detailing use of CRMP funds prior to the Task Force and the USFWS deciding to approve this new group for the funding originally granted for the next year of CRMP operation. We anticipate this presentation and decision would occur at the next meeting of the Task Force, and request that you place this item on the agenda and communicate this to the Siskiyou RCD and CRMP coordinator.

Klamath Forest Alliance is observing the newly formed council in order to determine its intentions regarding fishery restoration. The position KFA will take at the Task Force meeting concerning disposition of the approved but not yet granted CRMP funding will depend on a solid restoration plan presented by RCD and this new Council.

We request the Task Force and the USFWS review the following concerns:

1. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RCD AND THE SRWC: At the time of dissolving, the CRMP and the RCD were working on an MOU to define the relationship and responsibilities of each group. This MOU had become necessary due to questionable mingling of RCD and CRMP functions and the lack of clarity concerning administrative charges against the CRMP grant taken by the RCD. However, at the December 2, 1999, RCD Board meeting, the Chair in response to a question from a member of the Board

indicated that an MOU or similar agreement would not be pursued with the developing SRWC. We believe this is imprudent. The Task Force should require an agreement that meets the "Restoration Program Work Plan" Program Objectives as defined in the Cooperative Agreement (11339J027) and delineates roles and responsibilities of the new organization including financial arrangements and staffing prior to approving funding transfers for operation of the SRWC.

2. **ROLE OF AGENCIES:** As previously stated, the proposed operating rules for the SRWC provide for membership for individuals only and not for agencies. Agency personnel could participate as individuals but would not be able to charge time spent on the SRWC business to job responsibilities or collect compensation for this after regular work participation. This is likely to reduce agency participation and negate any previous objective for greater cooperation.

3. **EXCESSIVE POWER OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** Under the SRWC proposal, the executive committee is the authority for approval of all projects to be forwarded to the RCD. The various committees of the SRWC would choose individuals to represent them on the executive committee. There are no prescribed procedures for selecting representatives nor stated limitation on the number of committees which can form and thereby seek a seat on the executive committee. The executive committee would appoint a "technical committee" to perform technical review of all proposed projects and make funding recommendations regarding these projects to the executive committee. This is of primary concern to KFA. This method may easily become political and lacking in technical expertise, as no particular qualifications are required for membership on the technical committee. Under this arrangement we fear a return to projects that primarily benefit landowners rather than protect and restore fish.

KFA has proposed an alternative to appointment of the technical committee by the executive committee. We proposed that each of the four agencies with recognized specialized expertise in resource management as it impacts fisheries restoration (Forest Service, Cal Fish & Game, the USFWS, and the NRCS) appoint a member to serve on this committee. The Task Force would be wise to require a technical committee, independent of the executive committee, with proven expertise in fish biology and watershed restoration.

4. **SUB-BASIN GROUPS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE OF THE SRWC:** Some of the best work accomplished by the CRMP took place with and through sub-basin landowner groups. However, in the proposed structure of the SRWC these groups have no role to play in the process of developing and seeking funding for projects as only individuals and not groups may be represented.

KFA presented these four concerns to the CRMP Council and recommended that the Ad Hoc committee assigned to develop a restructuring proposal do more work to address these concerns and then return to the CRMP with their plan for reorganization. This proposal was rejected due to lack of consensus. As a result, KFA was not able to vote for restructuring the CRMP. There followed the prior conceived plan to subvert the consensus process and terminate the CRMP.

One of our greatest disappointments with the Scott River CRMP was the continued unwillingness of this group to use the funds provided by the Task Force to complete a sub-basin plan following the format developed by the TWG and adopted by the Task Force. In providing the funding, we believe the Task Force expected the CRMP to produce a sub-basin plan. We recommend that the Task Force specify that the primary task for the funding provided any new group must be production of a sub-basin plan according to the guidelines developed by the TWG and adopted by the Task Force.

Should the nascent council and RCD be unwilling to clarify their intention regarding these issues and make a firm commitment to complete a sub-basin plan if funding is provided, we urge the Task Force to recommend the USFWS seek a contractor or cooperator with expertise and interest in completing a sub-

basin plan according to the established guidelines. We want to emphasize that the current 'action plans' which the CRMP has adopted, even if adopted by the Scott River Watershed Council, are not sufficient to guide project development and selection in the manner intended for sub-basin plans. Lack of a comprehensive plan to guide project development and utilize funding in a cost-effective manner has resulted in projects that are ineffective or minimally effective in improving habitat for fish and other aquatic species. Key factors limiting fish production in the Scott River Watershed need to be effectively addressed. A solid sub-basin plan would help remedy this situation.

If the Task Force allows the RCD and SRWC to proceed in the ad hoc manner which is apparently intended, we do not believe the result will be fisheries restoration. Furthermore, such a course could result in furthering the agenda of the anti-agency, anti-environment property radicalism currently rampant in Siskiyou County. Hate crimes, agency intimidation and deliberate misrepresentation have already occurred in furtherance of that agenda. We urge the Task Force to neither directly nor tacitly support this radical property rights agenda, but rather to insist on fisheries restoration as lawfully intended.

Please provide a copy of this letter to each Task Force and TWC member either immediately or in the agenda packet for the next Klamath Fisheries Task Force meeting.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,


Carol L. Wright
Executive Director

Felice Pace
Klamath River Program Coordinator

Cc: Michael Spear, California/Nevada Operations Manager
Siskiyou RCD

People for the USA

Ric Costales, President
Scott Valley People for the USA
26310 Duzel Creek Road
Fort Jones, California 96032

Phone and FAX: (530) 468-2698
Email: tmbst@sisqtel.net

January 8, 2000

Mr. Ron Iverson
US Fish and Wildlife Service
PO Box 1006
Yreka, CA 96097

Mr. Iverson:

As a participant in Scott River CRMP and attendee of Siskiyou RCD meetings, I had occasion to read the Klamath Forest Alliance's comments regarding the newly formed Scott River Watershed Council and its grant funding administered in conjunction with your agency. As to the technicality of funding requirements under the grant discussed, I am unfortunately lacking in sufficient expertise to make any substantive comments.

However, as regards certain general statements, I feel it incumbent upon me to attempt some clarification and correction lest a one-sided presentation damage a very worthwhile effort.

By way of background for my comments, I must mention that I have been chosen as president and spokesperson for Scott Valley People for the USA, a local chapter of a national organization dedicated to preserving private property rights and multiple use of public lands. As I am sure you are aware, much concern and activism has arisen in our county relative to these issues dating from the widely publicized critical habitat designation for the coho salmon. From the outset of that controversy, despite the anger and outrage local citizens felt, the vast majority of newly-activated citizens felt that a determined, reasoned and credible effort operating within the established framework of our system of government was the only legitimate approach to achieving a solution.

Obviously, as regards any controversy, there are those on the fringes who seem to have some sort of vested interest in prolonging or aggravating the agony these situations cause. Despite KFA's reference to "hate crimes, agency intimidation, and deliberate misrepresentation," and "anti-agency, anti-environment, property radicalism," rest assured that none of these references apply to PFUSA. Our organization has continued to expand membership and gain credibility among diverse segments of the Siskiyou County community at what I believe to be an unprecedented rate. This would not be the case if we were on the "fringe,"

since most people in our county, while skeptical and increasingly discouraged, have an innate commitment to our system of government. In point of fact, Mr. Iverson, I have not seen anyone remotely fitting KFA's description of the "property rights radical" participating in the CRMP, RCD or SRWC. Rather, these types are sitting on the outside doing their best to undermine solutions.

From a strict property rights standpoint, it is the opinion of our organization that government only has control over private property on zoning, health and safety issues. While this certainly grants license to act selfishly or irresponsibly, I feel confident in saying that not a single member of our organization would so abuse our obligations to our heirs or our community. Rather, it is in the manner of responsible commitment that some of our members and supporters are involved in the CRMP/SRWC process.

The best answer to those who would decry private property rights as the "keystone" of selfish exploitation of the environment, is to clearly demonstrate commitment to responsible stewardship. The SWRC provides such an opportunity on individual, community and watershed bases.

Specific rebuttal:

- KFA: SUB-BASIN GROUPS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE OF THE SRWC. FACT: The sub-basin groups are specifically included in the flow chart of the organization.
- KFA: ROLE OF AGENCIES IS DIMINISHED. FACT: The role of agencies was already diminished when agencies recently decided that having their personnel voting (as in prioritization decisions) could oftentimes result in violation of statutes intended to avoid conflict of interest. The proper role of agencies is an advisory one, and the SRWC is structured that way.
- KFA: THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE POWER IS EXCESSIVE. FACT: The consensus structure of the Scott River CRMP gave too much power to organizations and individuals representing those organizations. This was a major reason for the demise of that group. As well, too many people voting who were unfamiliar with what was being voted on was serving to make decisions seem capricious. A smaller voting body, more involved in the issues being decided, and bound only to achieve only a super-majority vote were critical reforms in response. I cannot avoid the temptation to point out the hypocrisy of the allegation of "excessive power" coming from the organization that, in many people's minds, virtually held the CRMP hostage via the consensus process.

In closing I would like to mention that the mission statement of the Scott River CRMP made no mention of the interconnectivity between the "natural" and human communities. The CRMP mission statement made tacit concession to critical components of the flora and

January 8, 2000

fauna of the ecosystem, yet ignored concepts critical to the human component of our watershed. This was a major reason for the failure of the community to accept the CRMP. Everyone in the Scott River watershed has suffered as a result of this oversight.

The new principles as stated for the SRWC clearly establish the natural environment as its focus, but that focus is placed in a context that is hoped will encourage participation, engender credibility, build trust, and, above all, demonstrate that communities can successfully and responsibly manage environmental issues with "utmost respect for life, liberty and property ." (quote from SRWC Statement of Principles)

I hope that grant funding in support of this worthy effort is continued.

As was requested by KFA regarding their letter, I would ask that you provide a copy of this letter to each Klamath Fisheries Task Force and TWC member immediately or in the agenda packet for the next KFTF meeting.

In addition, I would appreciate a reply concerning your thoughts on this matter as they might pertain to insuring that SRWC meets criteria for support from your agency.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ric Costales".

Ric Costales, President
Scott Valley People for the USA

cc: Siskiyou RCD, Scott River Watershed Council

2/1/2000

felice pace/carol wright
klamath forest alliance

dear friends,

i've received and read several times a copy of your letter to mr. iverson of the usfws. i'm disappointed. as a member of the reformed crmp and also a financial contributor to kfa i'm left conflicted.

i smell sour grapes. from where i stand, or sit, it looks like you folks would like to pull the rug out from under the srwc. (gosh, i wish i could pronounce that word like i did with crmp). shame on you. i know that you were not able to meet all your ideals and goals during your involvement, but are you willing to take some responsibility for the outcomes due to your contentiousness and impatience for what is an ongoing journey to a better watershed. you know it's going to happen one way or the other, either by we the people, or by them the government. don't you believe that positive projects have occurred? are you so concerned about the ranchers getting some of their own taxpayers money back to benefit themselves and the environment at the same time that you'd kill everything? your letter is filled with half/truths.

why would you ask that the council prepare a sub-basin plan as a prerequisite to funding when you know we haven't been able to accomplish this so far with your participation over i don't know how many years?

are you a quitter who takes his ball and goes home because he doesn't get his way, trying to ruin it for everyone else, or are you the eco-warrior i understood you to be? why haven't you participated in the reformation? there are people who believe as you do, maybe not as rabidly, but who also see the ideal of working together and working things out.


i'm sorry but i do not wish to support an organization anymore that so easily throws out the baby with the bath water. please take me off your list and remove my name as a member. thank you.

good luck with your endeavors.

sincerely,

wing hondas





SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027

Phone: (530) 467-3798 FAX: (530) 467-3728 E-mail: jeffvdm@sisqtel.net

November 1, 1999

Dear Project Participant or Cooperator,

The Scott River Watershed CRMP Council would like to invite you to a dinner in your honor to be held at the Scott Valley Grange in Greenview on November 10th at 6 p.m. Since the enchiladas were such a hit last year for this event (even with the dogs), we thought that we would repeat that meal.

Andrew Eller will be showing some slides and giving a synopsis of the Fay Lane Riparian Restoration project which encompassed several miles of Scott River. It will be interesting to see the immediate results of such a large scale project although it will take quite few more years to see the ultimate results.

We certainly hope that you can make this event which is a celebration of those who are proactive in their efforts toward community-based resource management.

Sincerely yours,

Jeff Davis Marx, Scott River Watershed CRMP Coordinator



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Klamath
National
Forest

Scott River Ranger District
11263 N. Highway 3
Fort Jones, CA 96032-9702
(530) 468-5351
TDD (530) 468-2783

File Code: 1500
Route To:

Date: October 5, 1999

Subject: Employee Participation in Outside Groups

To: Executive Committee, Scott Valley CRMP

Many activities the Agency has been traditionally involved in have recently been called into question by a number of interest groups. Some situations have led to litigation on the national scale. This has caused me to reconsider our local involvement with the CRMP, in fairness to our employees and to provide direction vital to you for planning projects and effectiveness of your program.

In summary, a Forest Service Employee may not serve as a voting member or officer of any outside organization that has a financial or political tie to the agency he/she is employed with, to do so would be a violation of 18 USC 208 and 203. Our Office of General Counsel has advised me that our participation in CRMP business may continue in an advisory capacity only.

I must therefore inform you that this letter will serve as my formal resignation as a voting member of the Scott Valley CRMP and I am directing other participating employees to do the same.

This office will continue to support CRMP activities when the participation of our employees remains within legal bounds. My direction to agency employees is to continue to serve as advisors in activities not involving the prioritization of funds or projects. They may collect and analyze data, evaluate sites and serve as the technical reference within their discipline of expertise. They may not commit resources of the agency, only I have that delegated authority.

I suggest the following participatory structure:

Jim Kilgore or designate – Fisheries Advisor

Jay Power or designate – Watershed Advisor


Ray Haupt – Agency Advisor

This should provide the clarification you requested. If you have any questions please contact me.

RAY A. Haupt

District Ranger





SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP

"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
(530) 467-3798 FAX: (530) 467-3728; E-mail: jeffydms@sisqtel.net

October 4, 1999

To: Jim De Pree, Natural Resource Specialist and Board of Supervisors, Siskiyou County

From: Scott River Watershed CRMP Council

First of all, the Council would like to thank you, Jim, for speaking to the CRMP Council and interested community members on August 17, 1999 about your progress to date and intentions on a Groundwater Management Plan. The Council feels that it is important to be informed on such important issues.


The Council also feels that, in light of your presentation, the process to implement such a plan is moving very slowly and seems to be without a timeline. The Council would like to encourage an acceleration of the process, especially as it pertains to the Scott River watershed. It seems that the steps of pursuing funding and collecting information could be begun. If the Council can help in any way in this endeavor, please feel free to contact Jeffy Davis Marx, Coordinator, especially for funding source ideas and Lorrie Bundy, Project Coordinator, for data and information acquisition.

The groundwater can influence surface water quality, quantity and flow timing in complex ways in the Scott River watershed; these water issues, in turn, have important effects on fisheries and a variety of human activities that use water.

We feel that groundwater planning in the Scott River watershed is a critical step which must be undertaken if we are to succeed in helping to restore salmon and steelhead fisheries and preserving agricultural viability. Completing a groundwater plan for the Scott River watershed will build on and extend the work of the Scott River Eleven and Watershed CRMP Council. Please make it a priority and expedite the process as much as possible.

Sincerely,

Alan Kramer
Current Chair
Scott River Watershed CRMP Council



SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED CRMP
"Coordinated Resource Management Planning"

COUNCIL

P. O. Box 268, Etna, CA 96027
Phone: (530) 467-3798 FAX: (530) 467-3728; E-mail: jeffvdm@sisqtel.net

October 20, 1999

To whom it may concern:

From: Scott River Watershed CRMP Council

Re: Etna Shaded Fuel Break

In a consensus vote at the October 20, 1999 meeting of the Scott River Watershed CRMP (Coordinated Resource Management Planning) Council, the Council elected to support the project to do maintenance work on the shaded fuel break partially surrounding the City of Etna, California. The group highly supports such ecologically friendly projects not only involve landowners and agencies, but also offer community protection. It is a good win/win project.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Davis Marx, Scott River Watershed CRMP Coordinator

cc: Alan Kramer



SISKIYOU COUNTY CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION



Branch of
CALIFORNIA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION
1655 SOUTH MAIN STREET — YREKA, CALIFORNIA 96097

October 18, 1999

Scott River Watershed CRMP Council
P.O. Box 268
Etna, CA 96027

Re: Continued Council Membership


The Board of Directors of the Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association would like to tender its immediate resignation from the Scott River Watershed Council.

In concept, the Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association prefers and encourages the development of small landowner-based watershed CRMPs. In these groups, only landowners are permitted a vote and involvement by other participants is invitational and advisory only. We endorse the direct, voluntary participation by the landowner in these self-determined processes for establishing and working toward watershed goals.

Small landowner-operated watershed councils are comprised of members who are closest to the land and who have the authority to implement decisions directly in their day-to-day management practices. The so-called "multi-interest" CRMP removes the decision-making and educational process from the landowner, vesting it in a political council of interest groups and agencies. The Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association is of the opinion that the format/membership of the Scott River Council creates a "disconnect" between decision-makers/planners and decision implementers. As such, the Council has become just another unnecessary bureaucratic level.

The Siskiyou County Cattlemen's Association continues to support many of the fine cooperative on-the-ground projects currently being implemented in the Scott Valley. We would hope to see these expand in the future under the planning guidance of small landowner-operated watershed councils of neighbors working with neighbors and with the excellent technical support made available through the Siskiyou RCD.

Sincerely,


Marcia H. Armstrong
Executive Director



Siskiyou County Farm Bureau

October 18, 1999

Scott River Watershed CRMP Council
P.O. Box 268
Etna, CA 96027

Re: Continued Council Membership

The Board of Directors of the Siskiyou County Farm Bureau would like to tender its immediate resignation from the Scott River Watershed Council. It has been some time since we have actively participated in the Council's decision-making process and we feel that we can no longer permit our inaction to be interpreted as endorsement. Our representatives have indicated that obstructive/confrontational attitudes among Council members detracted from the creative potential and productivity of the group, rendering participation an unpleasant chore.


In concept, the Siskiyou County Farm Bureau prefers and encourages the development of small landowner-based watershed CRMPs. In these groups, only landowners are permitted a vote and involvement by other participants is invitational and advisory only. We have found groups such as the Shackelford-Mall Creek, French Creek and Shasta River CRMPs to be most effective in addressing habitat restoration and stewardship issues. We endorse the direct, voluntary participation by the landowner in these self-determined processes for establishing and working toward watershed goals.

Small landowner-operated watershed councils are comprised of members who are closest to the land and who have the authority to implement decisions directly in their day-to-day management practices. The so-called "multi-interest" CRMP removes the decision-making and educational process from the landowner, vesting it in a political council of interest groups and agencies. The Siskiyou County Farm Bureau is of the opinion that the format/membership of the Scott River Council creates a "disconnect" between decision-makers/planners and decision implementers. As such, the Council has become just another unnecessary bureaucratic level.

1

The Siskiyou County Farm Bureau continues to support many of the fine cooperative on-the-ground projects currently being implemented in the Scott Valley. We would hope to see these expand in the future under the planning guidance of small landowner-operated watershed councils of neighbors working with neighbors and with the excellent technical support made available through the Siskiyou RCD.

Sincerely,



Marcia H. Armstrong
Executive Director

VI

	Limiting Factors						
	sediment	barrier due to flow	barrier - other	lack of riparian vegetation	lack of habitat complexity	High Temperature	diversions
SCOTT RIVER							
East Fork and its tribs		Noyes Valley	Rail Creek				
			Bill Mill culvert				
South Fork	x						
East Side Streams							
Wildcat Creek	low	moult					
Sugar Creek	medium						x
French and Miner's Creek	high	at last diversion				x	
Etna Creek			Etna water supply	moult			
Johnson Creek							
Crystal Creek	x						x
Patterson Creek	low-med?	x					x
Kidder Creek		x					unscreened (funded)
Shackleford/Mill	medium	moult		x			
Moffett/McAdam/Soap	high	x	Mine tailings	x	x	x	
Indian/Rattlesnake/ Tyler/							
Little Patterson/ Graveyard		x		x	x		unscreened (in progress)
Meamber Creek and Gulch							
Sniktaw Creek							
Snow Creek							
Deep Creek							
Canyon Creek							
Kelsey Creek		x					

Draft 4/1/00
 Scott R. Limiting Factors

DRAFT Limiting Factors to Healthy Watersheds and
Healthy Anadromous Fish Populations in the Scott Valley
(11/19/99, 1/12/00, 3/20/00)

Target / Mission: Healthy Watershed and Healthy Anadromous Fish Populations

1. WATER QUALITY
 - A. Temperature (Jay Power)
 - B. Turbidity
 - C. Chemical/Nutrient Contamination
2. ACCESS TO HABITAT
 - A. Physical Barriers
3. HABITAT ELEMENTS (Jim Kilgore, Dennis Maria, Brenda Olson)
 - A. Substrate/Sediment
 - B. Large Woody Material
 - C. Pool Frequency
 - D. Off-Channel Habitat
 - E. Refugia
4. CHANNEL CONDITIONS AND DYNAMICS (Jim Kilgore, Dennis Maria, Brenda Olson)
 - A. Width/Depth Ratio
 - B. Streambank Condition
 - C. Floodplain Connectivity
5. FLOW/ HYDROLOGY
 - A. Change in Peak and/or Base Flow (Jay Power)
 - B. Increase in Drainage Network
6. WATERSHED CONDITIONS
 - A. Road Density and Location
 - B. Disturbance History
 - C. Riparian Condition
7. ACCIDENTAL MORTALITY
 - A. Unscreened Diversions
 - B. Angling
8. NON-NATIVE SPECIES
 - A. Increased Predation
 - B. Higher incidence of disease (?)

*Would excessive coarse sediment be under substrate in Habitat Elements, under Channel Conditions and Dynamics as 'streambank condition' or its own category?

1. WATER QUALITY

A. Limiting Factor: High Water Temperatures

Issue: "Water temperature influences the development and survival of salmonids by affecting different physiological processes such as growth and smoltification. Water temperature also affects the fishes' migration timing, ability to cope with predation, disease and exposure to contaminants. The preferred spawning temperature for Chinook salmon is 52 °F with acceptable upstream migration temperatures ranging between 57 °F and 67 °F (Reynolds et al., 1990). Water temperatures above 70 °F can delay adult migration (Bell 1990). Temperatures at which 100 percent of mortality of Shasta River¹ salmonid stocks

¹ Would it be appropriate to just change this to 'Scott River'?

occurs have not been determined although Reisner and Bjornn (1979) report upper and lower lethal temperatures levels for Chinook are 79.6 °F and 33.5 °F, respectively. Preferred water temperatures for Coho salmon range between 38 °F-69 °F while upper and lower lethal temperature levels are 78 °F and 32 °F, respectively (Bell, 1990)" (CDFG, 1997, p.15). High water temperatures create thermal barriers to migration.

Historic Condition:

Functional/Target Condition:

Existing Condition: The low velocity, open range of the Scott Valley is naturally prone to heating. The valley experiences severe diurnal fluctuations. The diurnal fluctuations in the canyon have less amplitude. Fish are present throughout the valley despite the heat. Location of fish may be related to cold water inputs. Ken Maurer² reported that water flows increase at Brazil Ranch (now owned by Menne). Shackleford Creek may offer cold water inputs to mainstem because it goes subsurface.

Timing, Frequency and Duration of high water temperatures must be explained.

Location: Mainstem and East Fork high, South Fork good

Cause:

- Lack of healthy riparian condition. Riparian constraints hold channel and create narrower, deeper stream channel. (See 6,C)
- Low flows results in shallower water which heats more quickly (See 5,A)
- Aggraded streambed creates shallow areas
- Sedimentation reduces or prevents interaction between surface water and cooler subsurface/ground water. Reduces hyporheic flows.
- Tailwater return to river on East Fork.

B. Limiting Factor: Excessive Turbidity

Issue: Turbidity can be defined as fine suspended sediments traveling through system and it affects all areas downstream of source. Excessive turbidity can abrade the gills of fish causing respiratory problems. It also reduces visibility for feeding. If there is too much for too long, turbidity can affect growth and thereby affect ocean survivability. Certain amount of turbidity is normal in the winter. Summer events can be especially stressful when added to high water temperatures.

Historic Condition:

Functional/Target Condition:

Existing Condition:

Location:

- Moffet Creek (3-4 incidents per year for last 15 years)
- East Fork to lesser extent (since floods, east side soils more vulnerable. Erosion a concern where farming right next to creek)
- Boulder Creek in Canyon (natural landslide)
- Etna Creek is good!

Questions:

- How long event does it take to clear after a storm event?

Causes:

- Surface erosion of DG soils
- Mass wasting of DG soils (landslides)
- Bank erosion due to natural conditions and change in flow regime. More erosion occurs in spring when river begins to meander.
- Headcuts lead to downcutting

² Information from Jeffy Davis Marx. 1/12/00

- Miner's Creek downcut but has lots of Coho - probably because there are many trees.

C. Limiting Factor: Chemical/Nutrient Contamination

Pesticides largely unknown, not listed under TMDLs.

USGS (Sharon Campbell) collecting WQ data - DO, turbidity.

Contact RWQCB and Bruce Gwinne to see what testing has been done.

2. ACCESS TO HABITAT

A. Limiting Factor: Physical Barriers to Spawning Grounds

(should this include barriers to outmigration, barriers to juveniles?)

Issue: Barriers prevent adult salmon from reaching spawning areas

Historic Condition:

Functioning/Target Condition:

Current Condition:

Locations:

- City of Etna diversion dam on Etna Creek has inadequate fish ladder creating a permanent barrier to migration, especially during low flows.
- Young's Dam on Scott River,
- Mill Creek culvert at road crossing creates boulder sieve - low flow barrier to spawners.
- Aggraded mouth of Mill Creek at Scott Bar - low flow barrier to spawners.
- Barrier on Tompkins Creek only in really low flows. (FPH, p.8)
- Big Mill Creek culvert (4 foot jump)
- Dam at Rail Creek
- Jackson Creek culvert (low priority – many natural barriers below and above)
- O'Neal Creek culvert scheduled to be replaced with bridge next year.
- Dredge tailings area and below create low flow barriers to adult Chinook

Many streams segments go dry each year in the known locations which could block access to refugial sites on streams. The following is a list of known problem areas:

- **Scott River (mainstem)**- In most years flows in the river go subsurface beginning in July in about a mile of the lower dredger tailings area (Sections 25 & 36 in T 41N & R9W) blocking both downstream and upstream access to fish in the mainstem of the Scott River.
- **Noyes Valley Creek** - goes dry (subsurface) in the majority of its lower 4 miles.
- **Sugar Creek** - In most years surface flow exists until it reaches the tailing area below the Highway 3 crossing where aggraded stream channel condition causes the flow to go subsurface. This situation is exacerbated by the numerous stream diversions on Sugar Creek.
- **Clarks Creek** - The lower approximately one-mile below the Highway 3 crossing goes dry in average rainfall/snowfall or dry years.
- **Etna Creek** - By mid summer, this stream begins to flow only intermittently beginning in section 33 of T42N & R9W (MDB&M) to near its confluence with the Scott River (approx. 3 miles). Surface flow generally persists in the last few hundred yards before it enters the Scott River.
- **Johnson Creek (ditched system)** - Flows into Patterson Creek . Goes dry annually in lower mid reach of valley portion. Water backs up from low gradient and use of diversion dams which maintains surface flow in lower mid reach. Water

quality is believed to be very poor (high temps and low D.O.s) in this continually watered section of the creek

- **Patterson Creek** - Goes dry each summer from about 1.25 miles above State Hwy 3 bridge crossing to a short distance below the Eller Lane bridge crossing. Gary Black indicates that there is historical reference provided by early settlers to the Scott Valley area which indicated that much of the valley portion of Kidder Creek naturally dried up during summer months.
- **Kidder Creek** - This stream goes dry annually from just below the Barker Ditch (near the middle of Section 36 in T 43N & R 10W (mdb&m)) to its confluence with Kidder Creek in Section 11 of T43n & R 9W (mdb&m)). The cause is a highly aggraded streambed exacerbated by stream diversions. Gary Black indicates that there is historical reference provided by early settlers to the Scott Valley area which indicated that much of the valley portion of Kidder Creek naturally dried up during summer months.
- **Oro Fino Creek** - Dry or Intermittent flows below the Altuna (Right Fletcher) Ditch near the Quartz Valley road crossing (near the junction of Section 19&30 in T 43N & R9W). Cause: numerous diversions.
- **Various tributary streams on the east side of Scott Valley between Moffett creek and East Fork of the Scott River:** These streams go dry naturally each summer and remain dry until sufficient rainfall returns in late fall or early winter. The east side watersheds sit at a relatively much lower elevation than those on the west side and consequently these eastside watersheds receive considerably less rain and snowfall each winter. In addition the eastside watersheds are relatively much smaller in size (except for Moffet Creek) than the watersheds on the west side of the Scott Valley.
- **Moffett Creek** - Goes dry annually approximately one-half mile below the State Highway 3 bridge crossing.
- **McAdams Creek (trib. To Moffett Creek)** - Goes dry for most of its entire length with a few intermittent pools. Throughout the upper 1/4 of its length. Water diversions in the Valley portion and past gold dredging activities throughout exacerbate the problem. Although juvenile steelhead smolts were found in lower Cherry Creek which together with Deadwood Creek forms McAdams Creek, the accumulation of mine tailings in the upper 1/3 of McAdams Creek has resulted in only intermittent flows in this upper stream segment in all but the highest winter flow events).
- **Cherry Creek (trib. To McAdams Creek)** - Goes dry annually each summer (mid) in its lower approximately 1 mile.
- **Indian Creek** - Lower 3 to 4 miles is dry or sparsely intermittent. May be a natural occurrence but small stream diversions likely exacerbate the problem.
- **Rattlesnake Creek & Tyler Creek** - The lower 1 to 2 miles either go dry or have sparsely intermittent flow. Believed to be a natural occurrence but small stream diversions exacerbate the problem.
- **Meamber Gulch** - The lower approximately one mile of this stream goes dry each summer. This may be a natural occurrence but a stream diversion known to exist may be the reason for the stream drying out or at the very least this diversion significantly exacerbates the problem.
- **Graveyard Gulch** - Goes dry in lower mile (from about dirt road crossing in Section 22 downstream.
- **Shackleford Creek** - The lower 1/4 mile goes dry each summer.

- **Sniktaw Creek** (Shackleford trib) - The lower nearly 1/4 mile goes dry each summer.
- **Emigrant Creek** (Shackleford Creek drainage) - Dries up from near headwaters to top of section 26 (T43N & R10W). Below this point Emigrant Creek picks up water from water diverted from Shackleford /Mill Creek diversions.
- **Mill Creek** - Each summer this stream goes dry from approximately the middle of Section 22(in T43N & R10W) to just above Mugginsville in the Southeast corner of Section 14 (in T43N & R10W) (approx 1.5 miles).

Cause:

- Dams
- Culverts
- Non-existent and inadequate fish passage structures

3. HABITAT ELEMENTS

A. *Limiting Factor: Excessive Fine Sediment*

Issue: Sediment "smothers eggs and aquatic invertebrates in spawning gravels, eliminates bottom cover, and reduces the size and number of pools." (FPH, p.5). Excess sediment creates cemented gravels and blocks the emergence of alevins. Reduces hyporheic flows.

Historic Condition:

Functioning/Target Condition:

Current Condition:

Location:

- The best spawning grounds are in flat areas which are now covered with sand. Look where spawning was once prevalent but now cannot due to sediment.
- Where is there NOT a problem? Grade in canyon prevents sediment from becoming a problem. (Dennis Maria)
- Moffet Creek

Causes:

- Accumulation of fine sediment reduces or prevents interaction between surface water and cooler subsurface/ground water. Reduces hyporheic flows.³
- Bank erosion due to trampling of streambank by cows (unmanaged grazing).
- Erosion due to poorly maintained roads on sensitive lands
 - References for road inventories: Tom Shorrey (Fruit Growers)
- Erosion due to certain logging practices (FPH, p.14)
- Erosion due to catastrophic fire
- Erosion due to natural conditions - DG soils (FPH, p.5)
- Erosion from mine tailings

Location: Scott River (and every stream from South Fork to Scott Bar), South Fork and Oro Fino Creeks.

I. HABITAT ELEMENTS

A. Limiting Factor: Substrate/sediment

³ Frissel showed sediment prevented feeding of subsurface flows and therefor affects water coming back. Dennis Maria observed that the shade provided by an addition of 18 inches of clean gravel led to a ½ degree reduction in temperature.

Target Condition: The sediment budget of upstream watershed areas is within the range and frequency of channel potential (based on parent material, gradient, disturbance regime, etc.) for the subbasin. (Anthropogenic effects (roads, harvest, etc.) are negligible and are not interfering with natural sediment budget. Indicators of the condition of the sediment budget, include pool filling, amount of fines in spawning gravels. Rapid Bioassessment results, others??). Some (how many??) 7th field subwatersheds within the subbasin may illustrate sediment indicators that are not favorable for some salmonid life history stages (spawning, egg development, fry emergence, rearing) and these conditions are caused primarily by natural events. (Knowledge of subbasin/subwatershed history in terms of watershed impacts – fire, harvest, roading, landsliding, etc. – is critical!). However, the vast majority of 7th field subwatershed in the subbasin, illustrate sediment indicators that do not hinder aquatic processes such as rearing/holding, egg incubation, fry emergence, aquatic insect diversity and development and such physical processes as stable streambanks and the initiation of hyporheic flow.

Problem: Poor spawning gravel quality, pool filling, reduced pool frequency, unstable streambanks, reduced overwintering capacity, and decreased aquatic insect diversity all result from excessive in-channel sediment. The preceding problems occur in several key locations for holding, rearing, spawning, etc., throughout the subbasin. Excessive fines within spawning gravels reduces egg survival and successful fry emergence. The diversity of aquatic insects is reduced, which in turn can negatively affect salmonid rearing. Unstable streambanks are considered as a separate indicator and are discussed below. Hyporheic flow potential has not been monitored within the subbasin, though areas of reduced stream temperatures resulting from probable groundwater upwelling are roughly known. Areas of upwelling in rivers are often very productive areas for several life stages of aquatic species. A reduction in these areas is expected to be associated with a loss of aquatic production in the subbasin.

Location: Excessive amounts of fines exist within spawning gravels throughout the entire mainstem Scott River. Low gradient areas (<2%) are especially excessive in granitic sand and occur within the valley portion of the Scott. Some granitic subwatersheds, such as Miners/French, show high levels of granitic sand and decreased pool volumes, due to pool filling. Moffet Creek often has a high sediment load, often runs turbid and contributes a large amount of fine-grained sediment to the Scott River. The dredger tailing area of the mainstem Scott River, located just north of Callahan, has very little riparian vegetation to constrain channel migration. Bedload movement from this area is also reported to cause extensive streambank erosion in adjacent downstream areas (Barne's, etc.). Large streambank landslides occur adjacent to the South Fork of the Scott (most are pre-1997). Large pools in the canyon area of the Scott are reduced in volume due to granitic sand loading.

Cause: Poorly maintained roads, older roads with poor surfacing and drainage features (no rocking, high collection and diversion potentials), harvest operations resulting in extensive amounts of compacted soil or exposed soil in the vicinity of channels all contribute to chronic additions of sediment to streamcourses. Overgrazed streambanks will also cause the same impact. The current, downcut condition of the Scott River in the valley also contributes significantly to exposed soil and unstable streambanks (a **reference to this condition would be good, Julia Grimm, NRCS**). Acute amounts of sediment are added to channels by failed road/stream crossings during large flow events. Landsliding related to anthropogenic and natural causes also contributes to channel

sediment loads. Recent, intense landsliding has occurred in the Tompkins, Deep/Middle 7th field subwatersheds, and to a lesser extent in the Canyon and Kelsey Creek drainages. (The latter two processes – landsliding, road crossings, harvesting - are analyzed site specifically for the Scott subbasin in the Elder & DeLaFuente Flood Report, 1999?)

B. Limiting Factor: Lack of Large Woody Material
A problem throughout the system.

C. Limiting Factor: Insufficient Pool Frequency

D. Limiting Factor: Insufficient Off-Channel Habitat

Target Condition: Desirable off-channel habitat includes backwaters with cover and low energy off-channel areas, such as ponds and oxbows. Cover and riparian vegetation adjacent to off-channel habitat is native in origin. Beaver ponds are present in the low gradient portions of valley tributaries. Potential off channel habitat would exist primarily in low gradient (<2%???), alluvial channels. These areas in the Scott subbasin are located primarily in Scott Valley and include significant portions of the mainstem Scott River and lower portions of major tributaries (but not limited to) such as Sugar, French, Etna, Patterson, Kidder, Moffet, and Shackleford Creeks.

Off-channel habitat would begin to appear naturally as slope and form (meander pattern) is restored to the Scott River and tributaries within Scott Valley, provided these areas are suitably buffered from some activities (unregulated grazing, etc.). Historically, beaver ponds were apparently associated with many of low gradient areas of the previously mentioned tributaries. (Year-around beaver ponds may have also been associated with areas of elevated water tables and upwelling groundwater???)

Problem: The Scott River and major tributaries within Scott Valley have been almost entirely channelized, resulting in a less meandering, downcut condition. Riparian forests within these areas are significantly reduced in size and species composition has been altered from the historical condition. Beaver populations have been greatly reduced accordingly. Historical floodplain access has been altered. The loss of off-channel habitat results in a loss of very productive rearing and over-wintering areas, often favored by species such as the coho salmon.

Location: As described, primarily the low gradient, alluvial stream and river channels present in Scott Valley. (See list of tributaries above).

Cause: Extensive beaver trapping occurred in the early 1800's. Channelization occurred in Scott Valley in the latter 1930's by the Army Corp of Engineers (supposedly to lessen future flood damage). Loss of off channel habitat (and riparian vegetation) has probably also occurred in a numerous, random actions since the 1850's as property owners sought to level fields, drain wetlands and increase useable land for agriculture, home, and townsites.

4. CHANNEL CONDITIONS AND DYNAMICS

A. Width/Depth Ratio

B. Streambank Condition

Limiting Factor: Excessive Coarse Gravels

Issue: Excess coarse gravels choke the river. Current flows cannot move material downstream. Energy is forced out causing lateral scouring.

Historic Condition:

Functioning/Target Condition:

Current Condition:

Location: Dredging Tailings

Causes:

- Tailings
- Large landslides
 - Kelsey Creek, Tompkins Creek after '97 flood (after while, used for spawning by Chinook)
 - Due to logging practices

B. Streambank Condition

Limiting Factor: Degraded Streambank Condition

Issue: Streambanks in some unconfined, alluvial areas, show a high frequency of streambank erosion, with much of this erosion, occurring in areas in addition to river bends. Undercut banks are scarce. Eroding streambanks is a significant source of sediment within the Scott River subbasin. Impacts to the aquatic systems as the result of increased sediment loads are described in 3.A. Eroded streambanks in alluvial systems are often associated with channel widening. This results in undesirable stream water warming and a decrease in habitat depth. Both of the latter effects reduce salmonid rearing capacity, especially during critical summer periods.

Target Condition: At most sites, streambanks are stable, well vegetated and maintain a desired channel structure. At most sites streamside vegetation is at site potential and reflective of a species composition and structure that was historically present. Floods of a 25-30 year return frequency do not cause major (& unexpected) changes in channel location and configuration. (**Basis of PFC concept**). After natural disturbances, such as large floods, natural vegetation recovers promptly. (Streambank particle size in these areas is generally small and vegetation is critical to maintain proper bank configuration. Water tables and the rate of drop within the water tables are able to support historically present riparian species). Two broad classes of streambanks are recognized for the Scott subbasin, those occurring in forested (often confined) areas and those occurring in broad alluvial, unconfined, low gradient areas. In non-forested unconfined systems, undercut banks are common and streambank erosion is infrequent, occurring on outside bends and in areas of localized constriction. (This latter class of streambanks is mainly found in approximately the same general area as described above for off channel habitat). In the area, confined streambanks are generally located in mountainous terrain and large vegetation is often dominated by coniferous species and associates. Streambank substrates are often of a large size, such as boulders and cobbles.

Location: Unstable streambanks are located primarily in Scott Valley and include significant portions of the mainstem Scott River and lower portions of major tributaries (but not limited to) such as Etna, Patterson, Kidder, Shackleford, and Moffet Creeks.

Cause: The current downcut condition of the Scott River in the valley contributes to the presence of a large number of exposed streambanks. Previous channelization and removal of streambank plants is largely responsible for the downcut condition. Lack of floodplain access by the river now causes larger flow events to stay within banks causing increased erosion. Rapidly dropping water tables in some years, partially resulting from the downcut condition of the Scott River and current water use practices in the valley, may not allow the timely regeneration of some historically present species, such as Black Cottonwood. Existing vegetation in some areas may not render the root depth and support that was historically present and needed to yield streambank stability.

C. Floodplain Connectivity

Limiting Factor: Loss of Floodplain Connectivity

Issue: Stream channelizing with associated levee building and streambank rip-rapping was done to keep the Scott River and other tributary streams from cutting into agricultural and pasture lands and to protect residences lying within the 100-year floodplain. This work has occurred throughout the past 150 years with the bulk of levee building activities occurring in the late 1930's by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers along a major portion of the Scott River (Valley portion). When the Scott River overtops its banks during major flood events the levees cause the river to separate and become disconnected at various locations throughout the valley. When the river finally begins to recede, major segments of the overflow channel lose contact with the river entirely and fish carried into the overflow channel can become permanently separated from the main channel and will eventually die when the overflow water settles out into low sump areas to stagnate and eventually disappear when the standing water either infiltrates into soil or evaporates.

Where levees occur there is a reduced linkage of wetland floodplains and riparian areas to the main stream channel. The occurrence of overbank flows is substantially reduced relative to the historic frequency which severely reduces wetland function and riparian vegetation/succession. The result is degraded wetland and riparian conditions.

Historic Condition:

Functional/Target condition: Off-channel areas of the stream or river remain hydrologically linked to the main stream channel allowing fish to return to the main channel stream as flood flows recede to the stream or river's single main flow channel. Overbank flows normally occur each winter which contributes to the maintenance of wetland functions, riparian vegetation and succession.

Current Condition:

Locations: Scattered occurrences throughout the Scott Valley where levees exist. (known major geographical areas: Scott River from vicinity of Fay Lane bridge crossing down to Hwy 3 crossing)

Cause: Elevated levees bordering the river or stream channel and lying within the normal flood flow channel.

5. FLOW / HYDROLOGY

A. Limiting Factor: Change in Base Flow - Seasonal Low/Subsurface Flow

Issue: Low flows limit amount of summer rearing habitat as well as the Chinook spawning in October and November in some years. Shallow waters leads to increased temperatures (LF#2).

Historic Condition:

Functioning/Target Condition:

Current Condition: "Many thousands of juvenile salmon and steelhead are stranded each year due to de-watering of streams in the Scott River Basin, based on CDFG fish rescue records. Redds are also sometimes de-watered in the autumn when water levels rise and then subside as a result of rainfall patterns in conjunction with diversions" (FPH, p.6). "Low flows in the Scott River and tributaries have contributed to poor holdover of adult salmon until spawning, blocked access to upstream spawning areas, and reduced availability of spawning sites" (FFAP, p.10).

Locations: "Streamflow usually goes subsurface in lower reaches of Etna, Patterson, Kidder (including Big Slough), Moffett and Shackelford Creeks each summer through early fall" (FPH, p.6).

Causes:

- Certain amount natural due to climate. Conditions exacerbated by the following:
- Agricultural diversions
- Residential/Urban Use
- Connected ground water pumping

B. Limiting Factor: Change in Peak Flows

C. Limiting Factor: Increase in Drainage Network

6. WATERSHED CONDITIONS

A. Limiting Factor: Road Density and Condition

B. Limiting Factor: Disturbance History

C. Limiting Factor: Riparian Condition

7. ACCIDENTAL MORTALITY

A. Limiting Factor: Unscreened Diversions

Issue: Many juvenile and some adult salmon and steelhead enter unscreened diversions and are lost. (FPH, p.6)

Historic Condition:

Functioning/Target Condition:

Current Condition:

Location:

Cause: Agricultural diversions

B. Limiting Factor: Angling

Issue: Overharvest of adult salmon will decrease sustainability of the population by reducing the number of potential spawners.

Historic Condition:

Functioning/Target Condition:

Current Condition:

Location:

Cause:

- Are current trout fishing regulations adequate to protect juvenile steelhead? (FPH, p. 17)
- Inability to distinguish hatchery from wild fish.
- Poaching

8. NON-NATIVE SPECIES

"Many fishery biologists believe that artificial propagation and rearing of native stocks are not the solution to rebuilding fish populations" (FPH, p.16).

A. Limiting Factors: Increased Predation

B. Limiting Factors: Higher Incidence of Disease

REFUGIA

Refugia are necessary to maintain a healthy anadromous fish population. Refugia refers to stream or river locations that provide all of the essential habitat parameters (i.e., good water quality (i.e., clear (low turbidity), high D.O.s (>7.0ppm) & a water temperature range 38-70°F), habitat complexity (LWD and other structural components that provide rearing and escape cover), adequate pool depths, good food supply (i.e., invertebrate population) capable of maintaining fish in a healthy and robust condition during all times of the year or during a period during their development critical to their survival.

Cool-water refugia exist and are scattered throughout the Scott River Watershed. However many of these are not adequately buffered by their adjacent riparian zone, or are insufficient in size, number and connectivity. Most refugial sites lack other physical habitat parameters as well which together provide for all the necessities needed to maintain fish health, vigor and the ability to survive even during the some of most severe environmental conditions. Stream habitat conditions degrade in the Scott River main-stem and in the lower end of some of its tributary streams to a point where anadromous salmonids are either severely stressed or die. Juvenile coho salmon and steelhead attempt to escape intolerable water quality conditions (i.e. high temperatures) each year in the lower ends of tributary streams entering the Scott River within the Scott Valley reach and in the Scott River itself. Loss of surface connectivity in many of these streams exacerbated by stream diversions and aggraded stream channels block access to refugium. Unable to reach safe refugium, fish that become trapped within drying and disconnected stream segments eventually succumb to stagnating water conditions that lead to lethal water temperatures or the lack of adequate dissolved oxygen. More rapid death may occur when an entire segment of the stream goes dry suddenly.

Functional/Target Condition: Refugial waters of sufficient size and quantity. These refugia waters should be spatially well dispersed, adequately buffered (by an intact, properly functioning riparian zone) and capable of supporting adequate numbers of fish that will sustain healthy and genetically viable anadromous salmonid and populations of other native aquatic biological resources within all tributary and main-stem waters of the Scott River watershed. Within streams and river courses, it is very important to maintain surface flow connectivity to refugial sites to allow fish to escape undesirable and sometimes lethal stream conditions elsewhere in the stream or other nearby waters.

Locations:

- Thermal refugia exists in all the permanently flowing tributary streams emptying into the Scott River within the lower canyon reach. However, lack of adequate habitat complexity (i.e., low levels of LWD) reduces the quality of these refugial waters.
- Thermal refugia exists above the uppermost water diversions on tributary streams entering the west side of the Scott Valley (i.e. where natural flows have not been reduced and good forest canopy is maintained).
- Thermal refugia exists (based on recent temperature monitoring data) within scattered locations along the valley portion of the Scott River including:

- Fay Lane Bridge area
- At the mouth of French Creek
- Horn Lane Bridge
- At the mouth of Etna Creek
- Tailings area below Callahan
- South side tributaries of the East Fork of the Scott River (& the upper 1/2 of the E.F. of Scott River from Rail Creek upstream?)
- Tributaries of the South Fork of the Scott River (& the most (all?) of the South Fork Scott River)

Sources

CDFG California Department of Fish and Game, Biological Needs Assessment for the Shasta River, Siskiyou County, California, 1997
 FPH Scott River Watershed Fish Population and Habitat Plan, 1997
 FFAP Scott River Fall Flows Action Plan, 1999
 Scott Limiting Factors Meeting 11/18/99
 Scott Limiting Factors Meeting 1/12/00
 Scott Limiting Factors Meeting 3/20/00

Limiting Factors on the Scott River Tributaries
 Developed from 3/20/00 Meeting at Fort Jones

SCOTT RIVER TRIBUTARIES	Limiting Factors
	Conditions to Protect
East Fork and its tributaries	Rail Creek barrier Big Mill Creek culvert Noyes Valley Creek dries up Grazing and riparian issues (unstable streambank, lack of shade) in Plowman's Valley and private lands Lack of pools, lack of shade
South Fork	Sediment from roads (DG) Mass Wasting due to roads, mining, natural conditions County road with big inboard ditch Historic Mining removed soil on streambank
East Side Streams (between East Fork and Moffet Creek)	Change in upland vegetation reducing flows? Grassland to juniper, shrubs. Anecdotal information about change in flows. Water retained and coming out slowly. Upland vegetation – symptom or cause? DATA GAP
Wildcat Creek	Klamath National Forest Callahan Watershed Analysis
Sugar Creek	Sediment (medium) (DG) Road location proximity to stream Seasonal barrier at mouth due to aggradation and low flows Subsurface at tailings Three active diversions and at least two not active.
French and Miner's Creek	Sediment (high) High temperatures in lower French in late summer Seasonal barrier – stream goes dry after after last diversion ditch. Platt diversion ditch. <i>(is Platt the last diversion ditch or separate issue?)</i>
Etna Creek (ask Gary)	Etna City Water Supply dam creates partial barrier to fish. Fish ladder inadequate. Diking along creek near Hwy 3 Lack of riparian vegetation near mouth Seasonal barrier dries up (subsurface?) in summer. Inadequate flow left in creek More water diverted than permitted?
Johnson Creek	High School group testing water quality (Allen Cramer)

Crystal Creek	Sediment from roads. Fruit Growers are planning to upgrade/decommission roads.
Patterson Creek	Fruit Growers roads project Sediment (low-med?) unknown Seasonal barrier – water goes subsurface due to aggradation Diked diversion
Kidder Creek	Seasonal barrier due to aggradation Significant burning (1955 fire) and harvesting Unscreened diversions? Lack of riparian vegetation at mouth. Riparian condition from Orofino up is ok. Question about Orofino Ditch or Creek? What is the original condition? Now splits off from Kidder and goes to Scott.
Shackleford/Mill	Sediment (medium) from roads Planned projects to inventory and implement road rehab. Lack of riparian vegetation Seasonal barrier at mouth Unscreened diversions (funded for screening)
Moffett/McAdam/Soap	Sediment (high) Barriers – no flow lower four miles in late summer/fall below Hwy 3. Channelized Lack of riparian vegetation No complexity Dredger tailings on McAdam Creek cause subsurface flows High temperatures Unstable streambank (especially lower reaches)
Indian/Rattlesnake/ Tyler/ Little Patterson/ Graveyard	Indian has good perennial reaches up high
Meamber Creek and Gulch	Channelized Lack of riparian vegetation Simplified habitat (low gradient riffle – no pools) Seasonal barrier due to low flows. Meamber Gulch diversion unscreened.
Sniktaw Creek (ask)	Fish screen project in progress Creek “looks good” to DM
Snow Creek (ask)	Debris torrent in 1995 sluiced creek creating young channel with no riparian vegetation.

Boulder Creek	Part of Lower Scott Watershed Analysis
Deep Creek	1987 fire, 1997 floods caused landslide and debris torrent
Canyon Creek	Some landslides, less severe than Deep and Tompkins Creeks
Kelsey Creek	Permanent fish barrier ½ mile above rearing channel. 1987 fire, 1997 floods caused landslide fall Chinook spawner use according to KNF GIS

VII

Scott River Watershed Council & Siskiyou RCD
PROJECT LIST (as of 6/12/00)

PROJECTS COMPLETED 1994-1996

<u>Project</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Status</u>
Flow Enhancement (water impoundment)	USFWS (Challenge Grant)	\$3,000	completed
Riparian Revegetation #1 & #2(habitat restoration)	USFWS(TF)	50,735	completed
Stabilization, planting, fencing (habitat restoration)	CDFG/USFWS/ (TF)/WCB	115,000	completed
Stockwater Study (survey)	USFWS(TF)	7,500	completed
Alternative Stockwater Systems (water conservation)			completed
KRIS (integrated data system)	USFWS(SWRCB)	30,000	completed
Locally Built Fish Screen #1 (fish protection/construction)	USFWS(JITW)/Dean Witter Foundation	14,787	completed
Student-built Fish Screen #1 (Fish protection, education, construction)	WCB	10,500	completed
Student-built Fish Screen #2	CDFG	9,987	completed
Temperature monitoring	USFWS/TF	9,418	data in KRIS
Workshops Watershed Management	UC Davis	1,500	completed
Scott River Watershed CRMP III	USFWS(TF)	32,258	completed
		\$284,685	

PROJECTS FY 1996-1997

Student-built Fish Screens #3 (fish protection, education, construction)	CDFG	7,857	completed
Locally Built Fish Screens #2	USFWS(TF)	14,787	completed
Riparian Revegetation #3	USFWS(TF)	30,282	completed
Scott River Riparian Restoration #1(integrated)	WCB/Cantara	400,000	monitoring
Flow enhancement (water impoundment)	USFWS(TF)	11,819	completed
Alternative Stockwater Systems #2/KRIS	USFWS(SWRCB)	30,000	completed
Temperature monitoring	USFWS(TF)	8,650	data in KRIS
Eiler Reach Revegetation	USFWS(JITW)	56,617	completed
French Creek Revegetation	USFWS(JITW)	33,682	completed
Fish Screen Fabrication/Maintenance	USFWS(JITW)	39,821	completed
Scott River Watershed CRMP IV	USFWS(TF)	32,340	completed
		\$665,855	

PROJECTS FY 1997-1998

Mill Creek Restoration (integrated)	CDFG	14,000	completed
Temperature Monitoring	USFWS/TF	7,948	data in KRIS
Alternative Stockwater Systems #3/KRIS	USFWS(SWRCB)	28,000	completed
Scott River Riparian Restoration #2 (integrated)	Cantara	47,692	phase II completed
Scott River Watershed CRMP V	USFWS/TF	39,006	completed
Scott River Watershed CRMP Coordinator	For Sake of Salmon	23,331	completed
Challenge Fish Screen Grant	NFWF/BR/NMFS	35,453	completed
Challenge Fish Screen Grant	CDFG	36,206	completed
Challenge Fish Screen Grant	Dean Witter Found.	5,500	completed
Challenge Fish Screen Grant	Sisk. Co. F&G Com.	3,800	completed

Locally Built Fish Screen Program III	USFWS(TF)	10,107	designing
Scott River Watershed Fish Screen Fabrication Project	USBR	32,879	designing
Scott River Landowner Riparian Program	USFWS/PW	13,485	completed
Scott River Riparian Restoration #2 (integrated)	USFWS/JITW	30,505	in progress
Scott River Riparian Restoration #2 (integrated)	NFWF/BR/NMFS	30,500	in progress
Scott River Riparian Restoration #2 (integrated)	USFWS(TF)	33,286	in progress
Alternative Stockwater Systems #4/KRIS	USFWS(SWRCB)	20,455	completed
Scott River Watershed CRMP VI	USFWS(TF)	39,890	completed
Scott River Basin Water Balance I	UC SAREP	14,850	completed
Shackleford/Mill Stock Water System & Fencing	USFWS	8,967	completed
Total CRMP Projects Funded for FY 1997-98		\$477,183	

Project Total for 1992-1997			\$1,427,723
PROJECTS (including unfunded proposals) FY 1998-99			
Shackleford/Mill Road Erosion Inventory	CDFG	41,605	completed
Shackleford/Mill Corridor Improvement Project	CDFG	33,084	completed
Shackleford/Mill Screen Fabrication Project	CDFG	17,778	in progress
Etna High School District Watershed Education	CDFG & TF	34,568	completed
Evaluation of Scott River Riparian Restoration	CDFG & TF	46,110	not funded
Scott River Monitoring Plan	CDFG	54,410	not funded
Scott River Basin Water Balance II	CDFG	41,509	returned
Scott River Landowner Outreach by Subwatershed	CDC	6,000	completed
French Creek Fish Fabrication Program	USFWS/USBR	43,338	funded
Scott River Groundwater Recharge Project	USFWS/USBR	18,217	not funded
Scott River Watershed Temperature Monitoring Program	USFWS/USBR	9,165	not funded
Shackleford/Mill Road Erosion Reduction Project	USFWS/USBR	99,521	in progress
Scott River Water Conservation through Irrigation Management Practices	USFWS/TF	42,796	second yr
South Fork Scott River Sediment Reduction and Training Program	USFWS/USBR	60,610	in progress
South Fork Road Erosion Reduction	USFWS/TF	47,795	not funded
Scott River Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP) VII	USFWS/TF	25,000	doing inventory
Scott River Monitoring Plan	USFWS/TF	24,187(Year 1)	completed
		22,429(Year 2)	Not funded
		17,130(Year 3)	
Scott River Water Temperature Monitoring Program	USFWS/TF	9,773	
Scott River Groundwater Recharge Project	USFWS/TF	7,124	Not funded
Salmon and Scott Rivers Chinook Spawner Escapement Survey (jointly with SRRC)	USFWS/TF	33,687	Not funded
Outreach Equipment (jointly with other subbasins)	USFWS/TF	9,890	Not funded
Mid-Klamath Smolt Trapping Survey	USFWS/TF	21,835	in progress
Total Funded FY 1998			\$413,332

PROPOSALS FY 1999-2000

Scott River Monitoring Plan (three years)	CDFG	62,836	not funded
Scott River Watershed CRMP Funding	CDFG	20,000	in progress
Scott River Watershed CRMP Technical Advisor	CDFG	32,549	Not funded
Evaluation of Scott River Riparian Restoration Program	CDFG	46,056	Not funded
Fowle Maintenance Project	CDFG	17,216	Completed
Scott River Riparian Restoration III	CDFG	69,245	in progress
Scott River Diversion Maintenance	CDFG	5,995	in progress
Scott River Temperature Monitoring	CDFG	8,162	Proposed
Etna High School District Watershed Education Program	CDFG	17,893	in progress
Scott River Monitoring Program (revised)	USFWS(TF)	84,609	Not funded
	CDFG	30,050	Partially funded
Outreach Equipment	USFWS(TF)	10,080	Funded
Scott River Geomorphic Analysis	USFWS(TF)	20,373	Not funded
	USFWS(JITW)	20,373	Not funded
Temperature Monitoring on the Scott River	USFWS(TF)	8,824	Not funded
	CDFG (2 years)	16,938	Not funded
Scott River Landowner Riparian Planting Project	USFWS(TF)	13,669	Funded
Scott River Watershed CRMP (VIII)	USFWS(TF)	34,722	Funded
	CDFG	36,160	Funded
Scott River Subbasin Action Plan	USFWS(TF)	48,341	Not funded
	CDFG	48,341	Not funded
East Fork of Scott Habitat Improvement	CDFG	32,915	Funded
Scott River Watershed Fish Screen Program	CDFG	23,564	Funded
Scott River Monitoring Plan (1 year out of 3)	CDFG	30,050	Funded
Moffett Creek Upland Gross Assessment	SWRCB	88,968	Funded
Scott River Temperature Monitoring	USFWS/JITW	9,165	Funded

Total Funded FY 1999-2000 as of 4/4/00	\$409,642
---	------------------

Total Funded FY 1992-2000	\$2,250,697
----------------------------------	--------------------

PROPOSALS FY 2000-2001

Scott River Subbasin Strategic Action Plan	USFWS/TF	10,582	Proposed
	CDFG	21,753	Proposed
Scott River Watershed Council	USFWS/TF	25,011	Proposed
	CDFG	39,336	Proposed
Patterson Creek Enhancement	USFWS/TF	27,708	Proposed
Sugar Creek Flow Enhancement	CDFG	925,441	Proposed
Etna Union High School Watershed Education Program			
	CDFG	10,532	Proposed
Etna Road Erosion Inventory	CDFG	49,224	Proposed

Scott River Fish Screening Program II	CDFG	77,553	Proposed
Scott River Enhancement Project	CDFG	52,164	Proposed
Kidder Creek Demonstration Project	CDFG	170,446	Proposed
Total Proposed 2000-2001			\$1,409,750

VII



SISKIYOU RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT
P.O. Box 268 Etna, CA 96027
(530) 467-3975 FAX (530) 467-5617
sisqrcd@sisqtel.net

June 13, 2000

Dr. Dennis Maria
Department of Fish and Game
1625 South Main Street
Yreka, CA 96097

Siskiyou Resource Conservation District
Scott River Watershed Council (RCD ref. # 89 VII FG)
Agreement # FG 8145 WR

	Final Invoice # 5	
	Qty	
Personnel Costs		
Program Coordinator (see attached)		
Project Coordinator (see attached)	40.6	649.60
Office Manager (see attached)	4	40.00
Staff Benefits		71.66
Total Personnel Costs		761.26
Operating Expenses		
Transportation (.31per mi.)	399.58	123.87
Copying (.12 per copy)	833.33	100.00
Office /Equipment Lease (50 per mo.)	1	50.00
Telephone, e-mail		-
Educational Workshops (workshop space rental, workshop host/speaker travel costs)		169.26
Total Operating Expenses		443.13
Subtotal		1,204.39
Administrative Overhead @ 10 %		120.24
Total		1,324.63
Retention 10 %		-132.46
Total		1,192.17

Thank you,

Carolyn Pimentel
District Manager

Siskiyou RCD Director

Scott River Watershed Council (RCD ref. # 89 VII FG) Agreement # FG 8145 WR

Scott River Watershed Council (RCD ref. # 89 VII FG) Agreement # FG 8145 WR											
	Estimated Budget	Adjusted Budget	Remaining Budget	Invoice # 1	Invoice # 2	Qty	Invoice # 3	Invoice # 4	Remaining Budget	Remaining	Invoice # 5
Personnel Costs											
Program Coordinator (see attached)	9,207.00	(413.76)	8,793.24	2,866.88	1,666.00	119	1,606.50	2,653.86	-	649.60	649.60
Project Coordinator (see attached)	2,240.00	(86.24)	2,153.76	292.51	310.50	29	406.00	495.19	649.56	40.00	40.00
Office Manager (see attached)	1,350.00	416.63	1,766.63	525.88	870.75	20	270.00	60.00	40.00	71.66	71.66
Staff Benefits	3,199.00	(1,418.66)	1,780.34	471.42	315.57		306.68	440.56	246.11		
Total Personnel Costs	15,996.00		14,493.97	4,156.69	3,162.82		2,589.18	3,649.61	935.67	761.26	761.26
Operating Expenses											
Transportation (.31 per. mi)	510.00	200.06	710.06	116.98	189.72		-	195.30	208.06	123.87	123.87
Copying (.12 per. copy)	325.00	212.30	537.30	337.30			-	56.09	143.91	100.00	100.00
Office /Equipment Lease (.50 per mo.)	250.00	-	250.00	100.00	50.00		50.00	50.00	-	50.00	50.00
Telephone, e-mail	101.00	-	101.00	62.44	5.82		11.16	21.58	-		
Educational Workshops (workshop space rental, workshop host/speaker travel costs)	1,000.00	1,089.67	2,089.67	303.95	677.38		674.34	313.89	120.11	169.26	169.26
Total Operating Expenses	2,186.00		3,688.03	920.67	922.92		735.50	636.86	472.08	443.13	443.13
Subtotal	18,182.00		18,182.00	5,077.36	4,085.74		3,324.68	4,286.47	1,407.75	1,204.39	1,204.39
Administrative Overhead @ 10 %	1,818.00		1,818.00	507.74	408.57		332.47	428.65	140.57	120.24	120.24
Total	20,000.00		20,000.00	5,585.10	4,494.31		3,657.15	4,715.12	1,548.32	1,324.63	1,324.63
Less 10 % Retention				-558.51	-449.43		-388.08	-471.51		-132.46	-132.46
Retention Due				558.51	449.43		388.08	471.51		132.46	132.46
								4,243.61			1,192.17
											1999.99

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COORD. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CRMP) (RCD ref # 89 VII)									
Agreement # 11333-9-1027, Project I.D. # PC-01 (effective date 10/01/98, expiration date 9/30/00)									
INV.	ITEM	SALARIES	TRAVEL	EXP EQUIP. MAT. & SUP. Office sup. copies, phone, post	OP & MAINT Workshops & Fair	Contract Sub Total	Date 10/1/99 Admin. 11%	6/30/01 TOTAL	
	BUDGET	15,500.00	1,000.00	2,000.00	4,000.00	22,500.00	2,500.00	25,000.00	
	Remaining Budget from Invoice # 4	(2,302.33)	(276.58)	(673.97)	3,418.68	165.80	38.64	204.44	
	Adjusted Budget	17,981.55	1,276.58	2,678.92	581.32	22,518.37	2,481.63	25,000.00	
	Remaining Adjusted Budget from Invoice # 4	179.22	-	4.94	-	184.17	20.27	204.44	
# 5	Dec 99								
	Gary - 5.5	94.08							
	Lorie - 5.5	85.14							
	Copies			4.95					
	Total Invoice # 5	179.22		4.95		184.17	20.27	204.44	
	Remaining Budget from Inv. # 5								
	Re cap of PC-01 Expended								
	Invoice # 1	3,326.06	253.89	418.04	142.59	4,140.58	460.06	4,600.64	
	Invoice # 2	1,960.67	186.93	504.10	20.64	2,672.34	293.96	2,966.30	
	Invoice # 3	8,663.05	616.28	1,311.40	201.81	10,792.54	1,187.18	11,979.72	
	Invoice # 4	3,852.55	219.48	440.43	216.28	4,728.74	520.16	5,248.90	
	Invoice # 5	179.22	-	4.95	-	184.17	20.27	204.44	
	Total Expended	17,981.55	1,276.58	2,678.92	581.32	22,518.37	2,481.63	25,000.00	

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COORD. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CRMP) (RCD ref. # 89 VII)							
Agreement # 11333-9-J027, Project I.D. # PC-01 (effective date 10/01/98, expiration date 9/30/00)							
IV. ITEM	SALARIES		TRAVEL	EXP. EQUIP. MAT. & SUP. Office sup. copies, phone, post.	Contract	Date 10/1/99	6/30/01
BUDGET					Sub Total	Admin. 11%	TOTAL
Remaining Budget from Invoice # 3	15,500.00	1,000.00			22,500.00	2,500.00	25,000.00
October 99:	1,550.22	(57.10)			4,894.54	558.80	5,453.34
Siskiyou telephone							
City of Etna rent							
4 November 99:							
AmeriCorps Service Learning Coordinator	907.00						
Ohlund's Office Supply							
U.S. Postmaster							
Jeffy - 147 hrs	2,182.78						
- Landowner Dinner					201.04		
- Phone			192.20				
- mileage							
- Home Office					15.24		
- Refreshments							
Lorrie - 16 hrs	261.04		9.30				
- mileage							
Carolyn - 19.25 hrs	298.28		17.98				
- mileage							
Brenda - 4.5 hrs	48.93						
Warren - 9.5 hrs	121.20						
Gary - 2 hrs	33.32						
Copying - 11/1 to 11/23				64.20			
Supplies				13.88			
Etna Hardware				4.28			
U.S. Postmaster				66.00			
Siskiyou Telephone				35.76			
Total Invoice # 4	3,852.55	219.48		440.43	4,728.74	520.16	5,248.90
Remaining Budget from Invoice # 4	(2,302.33)	(276.58)		(673.97)	165.80	38.64	204.44

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COORD. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CRMP) (RCD ref. # 89 VII)

Agreement # 11333-9-J027, Project I.D. # PC-01 (effective date 10/01/98, expiration date 9/30/00)

ITEM	SALARIES	TRAVEL	EXP. EQUIP. MAT. & SUP.	OP. & MAINT.	Sub Total	Admin. 11%	TOTAL
			Office sup. copies, phone, post.	Workshops & Fair			
IGET	15,500.00	1,000.00	2,000.00	4,000.00	22,500.00	2,500.00	25,000.00
Remaining Budget from Inv. # 2	10,213.27	559.18	1,077.86	3,836.77	15,687.08	1,745.98	17,433.06
Corrections from invoice # 1:							
Jeffy - 120 hrs	2,006.40						
Lorne - 18.5 hrs	300.48						
Fish Faire				0.31			
July 99:							
Stacey Stover - newsletter			111.25				
August 99:							
Jeffy - 100.5 hrs	1,530.00						
- mileage		212.04					
- home office			50.00				
- workshop food & lodging			87.79				
- phone			21.77				
- postage			6.14				
- newsletter			91.00				
- newsletter			14.94				
Brenda - 8 hrs	86.97						
Gary - 5 hrs	84.93						
Carolyn - 9.5 hrs	146.36						
- mileage		35.96					
Warren - 11.5 hrs	146.72						
- mileage		27.90					
Lorne - 11.5 hrs	184.17						
Chiund's - color copies			9.91				
Scott Valley Grange - hall use				25.00			
September 99:							
Warren - 8.5 hrs	113.62						
- mileage		4.34					
Carolyn - 14.25 hrs	220.78						
Gary - 3 hrs	50.98						
Jeffy - 92.5 hrs	1,416.07						
- mileage		95.79					
- postage			5.61				
- train travel to workshop meeting				73.00			
- phone			5.36				
- home office			50.00				
Lorne - 8 hrs	130.11						
- mileage		11.16					
Siskiyou Telephone & internet - 8/31			33.20				
AT&T - long distance phone			4.88				
Rav's Food Place - meeting refreshments			4.98				
U.S. Postal Service - postage			3.52				
Reliable - office supply			36.71				
- office supply			28.73				
Rav's Food Place - meeting supplies			3.05				
U.S. Postal Service - postage			33.00				
Copies - 8/23 to 9/28			200.64				
Siskiyou Telephone & internet - 9/30			18.79				
October 99:							
Carolyn - 11.5 hrs	178.20						
- mileage		8.68					
- meeting cookies			16.55				
Jeffy - 125.5 hrs	1,906.64						
- meeting refreshments			5.08				
- postage			34.65				
- video copies				36.00			
- mileage		211.11					
- home office			50.00				
- phone			9.08				
Lorne - 7 hrs	113.99						
- mileage		9.30					
Warren - 1 hr	12.75						
Gary - 2 hrs	33.88						
AT&T - long distance phone			6.84				
U.S. Postal Service - postage			46.50				
U.S. Postal Service - postage			94.71				
Pioneer Press - 1 yr subscription			24.50				
Scott Valley Grange - hall use				67.50			
Copies - 10/7 to 10/21			111.72				
Office Rent			67.50				
TOTAL INVOICE # 3	8,663.05	616.28	1,311.40	201.81	10,792.54	1,187.18	11,979.72
Remaining Budget from Inv. # 3	1,550.22	(57.10)	(233.54)	3,634.96	4,894.54	558.80	5,453.34

ER WATERSHED COORD. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CRM, RCD ref. # 89 VII)									
Agreement # 11333 9 J027, Project ID. # PC-01 (effective date 10/01/98, expiration date 9/30/00)									
ITEM	SALARIES	TRAVEL	EXP EQUIP. MAT. & SUP.	OP. & MAINT.	Sub Total	Admin. 11%	TOTAL		
BUDGET	15,500.00	1,000.00	Office sup. copies, phone, post.	Workshops & Fair	22,500.00	2,500.00	25,000.00		
Remaining Budget from Inv. # 1	12,173.94	746.11	2,000.00	4,000.00	18,359.42	2,039.94	20,399.36		
# 2 July 99			1,581.96	3,857.41					
Carolyn - 8 hrs	✓ 123.92								
Jeffy - 103 hrs + 1.5 hrs O.T.	✓ 1,579.24								
- mileage		✓ 179.18	✓ 50.00						
- home office			✓ 19.33						
- phone									
Lorrie - 8 hrs	✓ 130.10								
- mileage		✓ 7.75							
Gary - 7.5 hrs	✓ 127.41								
Meeting supplies			11.55						
Copies - June 22 to August 17			✓ 139.56						
August 99:									
Siskiyou Telephone & internet			32.46						
AT&T phone			✓ 7.80						
Postage			181.50	✓ 9.91					
Ohlund's - color copies for fair booth			214.50						
Meeting supplies			28.90	10.73					
Graphics by Ei - sign for fair booth									
TOTAL INVOICE # 2	1,960.67	186.93	504.10	20.64	2,672.34	293.96	2,966.30		
Remaining Budget from Inv. # 2	10,213.27	559.18	1,077.86	3,836.77	15,687.08	1,745.98	17,433.06		

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COORD. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (CRMP) (RCD ref. # 89 VII)						
Agreement # 11333-9-J027, Project I.D. # PC-01 (effective date 10/01/98, expiration date 9/30/00)						
IV. ITEM	SALARIES	TRAVEL	EXP. EQUIP. MAT. & SUP. Office sup. copies, phone, post.	OP. & MAINT. Workshops & Fair	Sub Total	Admin. 11%
BUDGET	15,500.00	1,000.00	2,000.00	4,000.00	22,500.00	2,500.00
May 99						
Jeffy - 120 hrs	2,006.40					
Lorrie - 18.5 hrs	300.48					
Fish Faire						
Copies - 5/3 to 6/14			266.76			
June 99						
Gary - 2 hrs	33.82					
Lorrie - 32 hrs	522.91					
- mileage		13.95				
Carolyn - 18.5 hrs	286.57					
- mileage		13.02				
Warren - 3 hrs	38.27					
Brenda - 2.5 hrs	27.16					
Jeffy - 155.5 hrs	2,367.33					
- home office	50.00					
- mileage		226.92				
- phone & postage			29.22			
- meals & lodging, meeting refreshments				72.59		
Postage			1.87			
Siskiyou Telephone			22.04			
Staples Direct - printer ink			24.56			
July 99						
AT&T phone			7.59			
Postage			66.00			
TOTAL INVOICE # 1	75632.94	253.89	418.04	142.59	76447.46	460.06
Remaining Budget from Inv. # 1	3,326.06	746.11	1,581.96	3,857.41	4,140.58	2,039.94
	12,173.94				18,359.42	
						4,600.64
						20,399.36


these amounts did NOT get added in to total above

31
70.00

missed
0.31

Correction made on Invoice # 3

2006.40
300.48
0.31
2307.19



Scott River Watershed Standing Committee Participants
1/25/00

Community Relations Committee

Mary Roehrich
Carolyn Pimentel
Ric Costales
Bernard Dowling
Larry Toelle

Education Committee

Gareth Plank
Bernard Dowling
Ric Costales
Andrew Eller
Keith Taylor
Wing Hodas
Dal Eklund
Ernie Wilkinson

Water Committee

Gary Black
Warren Farnam
Mike Bryan
Bruce Bradford
Wing Hodas
Jeff Fowle
Lorrie Bundy
Jay Power
Ken Maurer
Steve Orloff

Fish Committee

Gary Black
Jim Kilgore
Jennifer Silveira
Dennis Maria
Dave Black
Don Judd

Monitoring Committee

Carl Schwarzenberg
Jennifer Silveira
Gary Black
Lorrie Bundy
Dennis Maria
Andrew Eller

Upland (Land Use?)

Alan Kramer
Tom Shorey
Warren Farnam
Gareth Plank
Kyle Haines
Mary Roehrich
Bruce Bradford
Doug Blangsted
Keith Taylor
Ernie Wilkinson

- Committee member composition consists of expertise from biological, economical, hydrological, and as many more disciplines as deemed necessary.
 - Assist Standing Committees in developing project ideas.
 - Recommend project priority to Executive Committee.
- IV. Council Membership: Full Council = interested public.
- Serve as individuals.
 - No group representatives.
 - Anyone can be a member.

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL PRINCIPLES & OBJECTIVES

Adopted December 14, 1999

Definition of the Scott River Watershed:

Includes all natural resources and human interests in the Scott River drainage (e.g. wildlife, fish, peoples, properties, economic systems, etc.)

PRINCIPLES:

The primary focus of the Scott River Watershed Council's efforts will be on voluntarily conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

In its activities, the Scott River Watershed Council will conduct itself with the utmost regard for:

1. Individual life, liberty and property;
2. Custom and culture of the area (as defined in the Siskiyou County Comprehensive Land and Resource Management Plan);
3. The inextricable linkage of healthy communities and the natural environment.

OBJECTIVES:

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Inclusion: | Promote the inclusion of all interested individuals within the watershed. |
| Education: | Emphasize widespread dissemination of accurate and current watershed resource information. |
| Investigation: | Actively investigate new and existing methodologies for local watershed study and improvement. |
| Evaluation: | Evaluate proposed and completed watershed projects. |
| Action: | Work in cooperation with property owners to develop sound and cost effective proposals for resource conservation and enhancement. |

SCOTT RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL INTERIM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS
January 4, 2000

Interim Executive Committee: Gareth Plank (Chair for Jan. 18, 2000 meeting), Bernard Dowling (Vice Chair for Jan. and Chair for Feb.), Ernie Wilkinson, Dave Black, Alan Kramer, Ric Costales. Will serve until Standing Committees select representatives for February meeting.

STRUCTURE:

I. Six (6) **Standing Committees:** Community Relations, Education, Land Use, Water, Fish & Wildlife, and Monitoring.

- May use whatever decision-making process that works best within each committee group.
- Each committee selects/elects one member as its committee representative to serve and vote on the Executive Committee and selects/elects an alternate to serve in his/her absence with voting privileges.
- All interested individuals are encouraged to participate and may participate in the process by active involvement in Standing Committees.
- Four or five permanent core members are encouraged.
- Receive and develop project ideas from the community.
- Take project ideas to Technical Committee for help in project development and proposal processes.
- Prepare and submit written reports to Executive Committee prior to or during each full Council public meeting.

II. **Executive Committee:** Chair/representatives from each of the six (6) Standing Committees.

- The decision making, voting body of the Council.
- Decisions made by supermajority (5 out of 6 votes).
- Quorum of five is necessary for voting; in which case a consensus is necessary to pass measures.
- All decisions are made in the presence of the full public Council.
- Chair is selected by Executive Committee from full Council participants and serves as facilitator of meetings without voting privileges unless already a Standing Committee representative.
- Members and alternates should serve for a one-year term.
- Hold full Council public business meetings at least quarterly.
- Meet monthly to set educational and business meeting agendas, programs, call for special meetings, and arrange speakers, meeting facilities, and if necessary coordinate Standing Committee efforts.
- Appoint Technical Committee.
- Has final decision for project prioritization with input from Technical Committee priority recommendations and full Council.
- Presents finalized project proposal recommendations to Siskiyou RCD or other appropriate entities for funding and implementation.
- Has final decision on project ranking criteria and planning documents.

III. **Technical Committee:** Capacity is for advising Standing Committees and project priority ranking recommendations to Executive Committee.

- Appointed by Executive Committee.