

DRAFT Meeting Summary  
Battle Creek Watershed Working Group July 19, 2011: 10 am – 2 pm  
Conference Room, RBFWO, 10950 Tyler Road, Red Bluff, CA 527-3043

**I. Convene/Introductions:** Present: Tricia Parker Hamelberg, Steve Emershy, Virginia Phelps (BCWA alternate), Kathy Bishop, Sharon Paquin Gilmore, Steve Hirsch, Harry Rectenwald, Jim Smith, Glenn Graham, Michael Melanson, Tom McCubbins, Liv Imset, Michael Strawn, Naseem Alston, Mike Berry, Mary Marshall, Rich Reiner. Teleconference line: Susan Chappell (LNF alternate), Angela Wilson, Kerry Burke, Teresa Connor and Sue Horkey (alternate for the Shasta Trinity Fly Fishing Group).

A. Review ground rules: Sharon read the Operating Principles in the 2004 MOU.

B. Review January, March and May 2011 meeting summaries:

\*\*\* The Jan, March and May meeting summaries were approved with the BCWC additions included. (Names of people attending were added to the Jan & May meeting summaries).

Review and approve agenda: approved.

**II. Announcements and round-the-table updates (all participants)**

Smith/FWS: We received our Regional Office comments on the Biological Assessment for Coleman National Fish Hatchery. Soon, the final Biological Assessment and the draft Biological Opinion will be sent to National Marine Fisheries Service. At the same time, the final Biological Assessment will be sent out to the public.

Berry/DFG: DFG has advertised for a staff ES position. The person selected should be announced in August. Also, DFG is developing an MOU with BLM to take over management of the little park near Battle Creek at Gover Rd/Balls Ferry Rd. BLM is in the process of acquiring the Gover Ranch in two phases.

Q: Bishop: What is the current status of eradication of invasive plants on the DFG managed lands in lower Battle Creek?

A: Eradication of invasive plants is one of DFG's objectives, but there is currently no funding for this activity.

Reiner/TNC: TNC is actively involved with the Stewardship Council regarding disposition of PG&E properties.

McCubbins/TCRCD: TCRCD is considering four of these Stewardship Council properties too.

### III. Updates

- A. P. G. & E. (Liv Imset): Other than all of the activity associated with the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project, there is not much going on right now. We are preparing to replace the walkway at Lake Nora in Aug – Sept. The annual overhaul of the Coleman Canal will also occur in mid August.
- B. USFWS (Tricia Parker Hamelberg): refer to “FWS Updates” handout
- C. Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy (Sharon Paquin-Gilmore)
- i. The Conservancy’s annual meeting is Sept 7. Details will be forthcoming. All are welcome to attend.
  - ii. Harry/ Terraqua: following the MOU Highlights presentation today, the points that the BCWC wants to add will be emphasized.
- D. Issue-Tracking- Document: top issues (Kathy Bishop) :

The two updates from Mary were read aloud and will be incorporated by Kathy.

\*\*\* ACTION: The Chair, Sharon Paquin Gilmore, asks that each contact person shown in the Issue Tracking Document to review and update their respective portion before each working group meeting. Refer to the BCWC website for the current version of the document e.g. [http://www.battle-creek.net/docs/gbcwvg/GBCWWG\\_Issues\\_Tracking201102.pdf](http://www.battle-creek.net/docs/gbcwvg/GBCWWG_Issues_Tracking201102.pdf)

- E. Restoration Project (Mary Marshall, USBR)

*[Under Phase 1A of the project, the majority of the fish ladder construction was completed at Eagle Canyon and North Battle Creek Feeder dams in 2010. Construction at these project sites has resumed, and work is planned to be completed late 2011. In regard to the Wildcat project site, some road erosion issues will be corrected in Summer 2011. For the Asbury/Baldwin Creek site, design specifications are under development and a contract is planned to be awarded early 2012. Under Phase 1B of the project, construction of the Inskip powerhouse tailrace connector and bypass is proceeding and currently planned to be completed by late 2012. Under Phase 2 of the project, agreements (to receive State funding) are underway and are planned to be completed in 2011. Construction is currently planned to occur under two contracts. One construction contract would involve the installation of a fish screen and ladder at Inskip diversion dam, installation of a tailrace tunnel connector from South Powerhouse to Inskip Canal, and removal of Lower Ripley Creek Feeder and Coleman diversion dams. Another construction contract would involve the removal of Soap Creek Feeder diversion and the removal of South diversion dam and appurtenant conveyance system, including the removal of South Canal. These construction contracts are currently anticipated to be awarded in 2012 and be completed in 2015.]*

*Monthly construction updates (including photos) are posted on the Battle Creek Restoration Project Reclamation website ([www.usbr.gov/mp/battlecreek](http://www.usbr.gov/mp/battlecreek)).*

*A contract associated with the facilitation and development of a Coleman National Fish Hatchery Adaptive Management Plan is planned to be awarded by early September 2012. {mm 7/22}}*

Q: (Berry) What is the status of Asbury?

A: We had a meeting and agreed on design. The award for the contract is planned for March 2012.

Q: (Kerry Burke) Who will own these hatcheries?

A (Berry) To avoid building a pipeline to protect water quality, DFG agreed to purchase three of the hatcheries. The part of the business that moves fish to other parts of the state is being purchased by DFG. The landowners can do some other types of business. DFG will inspect the facility and take possession of equipment .

#### **IV. Presentation (20 minutes):**

##### **2004 Greater Battle Creek Watershed Working Group Memorandum of Understanding (Tricia Parker Hamelberg)**

Tricia described that she works as a biologist for the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP). This program is guided by the AFRP Plan (2001) which uses an Implementation Approach calling for local involvement, public support, adaptive management and flexibility to be the methods to restore anadromous fish to California's Central Valley. Her role as a Habitat Restoration Coordinator with the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program is to encourage local involvement with the goal of attaining habitat for natural salmonid production. Her strategy is watershed management at the local level -- based on joint fact finding, information sharing and solving problems at the lowest/most local level possible.

This group was initiated by stakeholders and is working towards shared goals. The 2004 MOU was developed to help this group more clearly organize towards those shared goals. Earlier this spring, members reviewed the document and updated their representatives on the roster (handout). Today, we'll review the highlights in the document. (See attachment.)

##### Discussion of MOU

- Membership is defined in the MOU as “no more than 8 public agencies and no more than 8 non-public agencies, all of whom shall be signatories to the MOU.”
- When we vote, only the members vote.
- All are welcome to attend meetings.
- The purpose of this is to maintain balance.
- The number and representation of members has evolved over time. Originally, twelve signatures were received. Since then, two became non-participatory (Central Valley Project Water Authority and Bureau of Land Management) and two have requested / attained membership (Shasta Trinity Fly Fishers and Battle Creek Watershed Alliance).

- Some other groups have recently expressed interest in pursuing the process to become “members”: Tehama County Resource Conservation District (Tom McCubbins), Central Valley Regional Board (Drew Coe/ Angela Wilson), SPI (Steve Emershy).
- Harry Rectenwald/Terraqua/BCWC: The BCWC is interested in emphasizing:
  - Page 1: The working group will use approaches to assist the BCWC in reaching its community strategy goals.
  - Objectives: The working group will use collaboration
  - Page 4, item c: the strategy includes the BCWC strategy. The BCWC is happy that the Biological Assessment for Coleman and Livingston Stone NFHs is being shared. We will send comments on the BA to National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Q: In regards to future amendments, would federal agencies need to have legal/solicitor review again? (Sharon)
- A: Yes (Jim Smith).

Q: (Virginia): If the goal of this group is to work to preserve the economic and environmental resources of the Battle Creek watershed, we need to have some public outreach to let the public know more about “why the fish are important”, “what is the value of the forest” and “why is the Battle Creek Restoration Project important”. Could some kind of outreach meeting be organized for this fall or sometime soon?

- A: Yes (Jim Smith). My staff at the Red Bluff Fish and Wildlife Office have various outreach activities describing what we do and how the fish are important. This working group has an outreach subcommittee (Tricia, Sharon, Liv) that could work on this outreach event. Perhaps a mid-way Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project Update could be a component of this meeting.
- Rich Reiner: The TNC has information from Gretchen Daily, Stanford University, that could be applicable to this event. Or, would an editorial article in a local or regional newspaper be considered as a forum for this information?
- Discussion on best location for meeting (e.g. BCWC Annual Mtg (no), Manton Grange (maybe), Gaia Hotel (maybe), Anderson Senior Center (maybe)).

\*\*\* Action: The outreach subcommittee (Sharon, Tricia, Liv, Mary and Virginia) will meet subsequent to this meeting to refine the outreach meeting purpose. At the September meeting, they will report on the date, time, location and agenda for the Outreach/Public Meeting.

## V. Public Comment

Sharon clarified that this section on the agenda is an opportunity for any public to comment and/or suggest agenda items.

No comments were received.

## VI. Closure

### A. Meeting review & summary of action Items

\*\*\* ACTION: The Chair, Sharon Paquin Gilmore, asks that each contact person shown in the Issue Tracking Document to review and update their respective portion before each working group meeting. Refer to the BCWC website for the current version of the document e.g. [http://www.battle-creek.net/docs/gbcwwg/GBCWWG\\_Issues\\_Tracking201102.pdf](http://www.battle-creek.net/docs/gbcwwg/GBCWWG_Issues_Tracking201102.pdf)

\*\*\* Action: The outreach subcommittee(Sharon, Tricia, Liv, Mary and Virginia) will meet subsequent to this meeting to refine the outreach meeting purpose. At the September meeting, they will report on the date, time, location and agenda for the Outreach/Public Meeting.

### B. Identification of agenda topics and presentations / Future meetings

Sept 13, 20 or 27: Possible site visit to BLM land or presentation on Coleman NFH's Biological Assessment. Report from Outreach Subcommittee. **[update: the BCWG meeting is now scheduled for Sept 29.]**

\*\*\* Action

Nov 1, 8 or 15: Potential outreach meeting to address the broad environmental question of “why is the Battle Creek Watershed important” **[update : the BCWG will ~~likely meet in~~ meet on the 15<sup>th</sup> of November, possibly for a site visit to BLM land. Per Sharon Gilmore, the outreach meeting will likely be postponed until spring 2012]**

Future potential topics:

- Presentation on the adaptive management process that is being considered by the Project Management Team (Smith).
- Review of the Kier/Higgins report: Sharon responded that *there is a false allegation made regarding the BCWC in the executive summary of the Kier document. Because the document has been used in litigation and is attached to pending litigation, the BCWC cannot engage in discussion about it. The BCWC Board policy is not to be involved in litigation of any kind. Liv Imset pointed out that the same is true for the GBCWWG (part of our MOU); therefore, it cannot be an agenda item. [spg7/21]*

## VII. Adjourn