Battle Creek Work Group: Draft Meeting Summary for November 20, 2014
10 am- 2 pm at the USFWS Office, 10950 Tyler Road, Red Bluff CA

I. Call to Order-- Chair Elisabeth Rossi. The presentation will occur first on the agenda today to accommodate the speaker’s schedule.

II. Presentation
Tricia Bratcher, CDFW, [AFRP funded] marijuana eradication efforts in Shasta and Tehama Counties

Tricia’s Powerpoint presentation will be available on the Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy’s website. Highlights of her talk included:

- Each plant requires 5-15 gallons of water per day. The growing period is 150 days. In 2005, 98,000 plants were grown. In recent years the numbers of plants and numbers of “grow sites” has rapidly increased and many sites are being found on both public and private lands.
- Within the last ten years, there is a high rate of land conversion (e.g. from timberland into marijuana gardens) in Tehama County. These changes are viewable from Google Earth.
- The CDFW Wardens are putting the locations of grow sites into a database.

Discussion:
Trigger Question: Are there any land managers/owners around-the-table who are willing to share their experiences on this topic for the Battle Creek watershed?

Dave Worthington: I attended the Nov 17th public hearing on the potential ESA listing of the fisher. I was surprised to hear that many speakers from the audience expressed that illegal marijuana grows were diminishing. Those comments were very different from what has been presented today.

Michelle Havens: At Lassen National Park, the patrols to look for grows on publicly managed land have increased although no grows have been found [11/24 update].

Steve DeBonis: There has been significant amounts of marijuana grow activity on SPI Land in the Battle Creek watershed. The cartels are definitely a problem in the Battle Creek watershed. We have seen about 100 plants per acre. These aren’t huge grows, but it is a case of death-by-1,000-cuts. Illegal marijuana grows were busted on SPI’s land near Panther, Soap and Digger Creeks. It seems that the growers are walking in from Forward Road at the “C-Line” road.

PG&E: Kelly: My staff and I don’t know of any specific illegal grow sites, but we have been cautioned from our Land Department about the armed guards who are protecting grow sites in this area.
Jim Smith: The reason that AFRP is involved in funding a study on marijuana is to get some science behind the issue. The pilot year was 2013. By 2016 the work will be finished.

Melanie: Will check with her forest’s Law Enforcement branch.

*** Action: Steve Tussing will post the presentation from CDFW Tricia Bratcher on the BCWC website.

### III. Introductions


Participation Updates:

LVNP: Goodbye to Dave Worthington, the Chief of Natural Resources, as he transfers to another park. Welcome to Katie- the new Ecologist. Michelle Havens, the Planning and Environmental Compliance Specialist, will be Lassen Park’s representative at future BCWG meetings.

PG&E: Kudos to Gene Geary for serving this group since 1997 and best wishes for a grand retirement (round of applause). Welcome to Jon Walsh who will be the new PG&E biologist.

### IV. Sept Meeting Summary:

Approved with minor changes.

### V. Old Business:

Status of Action Items: n/a

### VI. New Business: Announcements/Public Comments & Updates (all representatives)

Note: For future meetings, this will be referred to as “Round Table Public Comment”

PG&E: Elisabeth: PG&E is reviewing the letters received from agencies on the draft Phase 2 FERC license amendment. The four agencies (USFWS, CDFW, USBR and NOAA) plus PG&E will meet today following this meeting to discuss the 2015 Coleman powerhouse outage.

LVNP: Michelle: We have good news – there is snow in the park. (e.g. 10 inches at 8250 ft, updated 32” on Dec 1st [http://cdec.water.ca.gov/cgi-progs/queryDaily?LLP](http://cdec.water.ca.gov/cgi-progs/queryDaily?LLP)).
Shasta Trinity FlyFishers: Glenn Graham: We are building a new clubhouse in Redding.

UCD: Jameson Henkle: The CVRWQCB hired UCD to characterize fine sediment contribution into the Battle Creek watershed. We have installed 2 of 4 monitoring sites. We are using GIS and collecting turbidity information to develop relationships between streamflow and turbidity. For now, we are trying to collect baseline information. Eventually we will identify high risk sites for fine sediment production and transport. We are interested in co-locating turbidity sensors with stream gauges.

USFWS: CNFH: Scott Hamelberg: Since the meeting in September, we held the Salmon Festival and counted 5,800 people in attendance. We were relieved to see that attendance was on par with past festivals, especially since last year’s festival had to be cancelled due to the 16 day federal government shutdown. The rain event in late October caused problems. The streamflow at Coleman NFH increased 1,000 cfs in 30 minutes. The facility was overwhelmed with turbid water. The sediment was very fine and found its way through the station’s water treatment facility’s filtration equipment. About 1,000 trays of salmon eggs (+/- 12 million eggs) were covered with fine sediment and/or had clogged screens. Many additional staff hours were spent painstakingly cleaning out the fine sediment from the trays. The eggs were at various stages of development with some groups in a more sensitive developmental stage which will affect survival of some groups. We’ll share photos at the next meeting.

Discussion on the high flow event and other impacts throughout watershed:

RBFWO: Laurie Earley: We measured really high turbidities on Rock Creek, 41.7 NTU instead of the usual 2.5 NTU.

SPI: We didn’t lose any roads during this high flow event.

PG&E: We had damage to the access road near South Canal.

CVRWQCB (Shane and Griffin): High flows and lots of erosion almost caused the loss of a ditch wall on Bull Ditch near Manton. This would have caused loss of the domestic water supply for all the people who depend on ditch water for their domestic water supply. Culverts were blown out on Rock Creek. There was a lot of damage. Most of the turbidity seen on the mainstem Sacramento River in Red Bluff was due to the input of fine sediment from the Battle Creek watershed. Two small-scale proposals for FRGP type work could be re-written and consolidated into one larger proposal for FRGP work.

CDFW: Jason Roberts: The FRGP (Fisheries Restoration Grant Program) Timber Grant Program could be accessed to seek funds to remediate for the legacy effects of private timber harvest on private land. The applicants for these funds can be an NGO, tribe (or possibly a federal agency).
*** ACTION: Steve Tussing/BCWC will write a proposal to the FRGP fund source. He will share the draft proposal with the fine sediment subcommittee, then submit it from the BCWC (an NGO). Steve will also work with Shane Edmunds and Jason Roberts. If successful, the funds would assist with some soil stabilization efforts to prevent additional fine sediment contribution to the streams in this watershed.

*** ACTION: The CVRWQCB staff will consolidate information on this large rainfall event and give a more comprehensive presentation at the January 20th BCWG meeting. Please send any photos and/or info to Shane.Edmunds@waterboards.ca.gov

Lunch break

Roundtable Public Comment (continued)

USFWS CNFH Scott H: A propagation program for winter Chinook salmon was first developed at Coleman NFH in 1989 as part of the Ten Point Plan for restoration of Winter Chinook Salmon. Operations were moved to the newly constructed Livingston Stone NFH in 1998 to overcome imprinting issues. The winter Chinook salmon program is a conservation program not a harvest mitigation program like other program at Coleman NFH.

USFWS RBFWO Jim Smith: The Hatchery Evaluation Program needed to change protocols due to the high turbidity from the late October rainfall event. The high turbidity made use of the video cameras at the fish counting weir hard to use, so a DIDSON camera was set up instead.

Regarding the proposal for a new hydropower facility “Lassen Lodge”, the fish agencies and USBR have all provided comments and “intervened” in order to stay involved in the proposal review.

Laurie Earley: See the USFWS handout. Our Tributary Monitoring Program usually sees salmon redds on the North Fork, following the Wildcat Dam removal. This year was unique in that we saw 46% of the redds on the South Fork of Battle Creek.

BCWC: Steve Tussing: a) The South Fork Battle Creek near Angel Falls (close to Mineral) is dry. b) Following up on Ponderosa Fire Effects study: the macroinvertebrates have been sent to the CDFW lab in Chico to determine water quality metrics. c) Attended a public meeting regarding the proposal for a new hydropower facility “Lassen Lodge”. Comments from the public are being collected.

*** ACTION: Steve will gather copies of all the agency letters regarding Lassen Lodge and post them on the BCWC website. He will also summarize what the potential impact of the proposed Lassen Lodge hydropower project will be on the Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project.
CDFW: Jason Roberts: The funds for two “drought projects” are being used to address two long-standing issues in the Battle Creek watershed. In regards to the issue of re-introducing Winter Chinook Salmon, an Intent to Award funds to a consultant has been issued. In regards to the natural fish barriers on North Fork Battle Creek (near Digger Creek and Eagle Canyon Dam, RM 5.06 and 5.41), a Request-For-Qualifications (RFQ) has gone through CDFW’s Dept of Engineering and will be sent out for bids in the next few weeks. We are targeting that it will be 18 months until we have “designs” in hand to choose which alternatives would best be implemented to remediate these two natural barriers. Future steps will be completing the permitting then implementing the proposed remediation.

USBR: Trang and Mary: See the 2 handouts regarding the Adaptive Management Program and Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project. Also, note the USBR website for updates. Mary noted that the timeline for the Restoration Project shows the ten-years between 1999-2009 – between first receipt of funds to the first time that USBR could award a construction contract.

NOAA/NMFS: Naseem: No update.

CVRWQCB (aka Regional Board Shane and Griffin): We still don’t have any results from the “CLAM” aquatic monitoring project because the equipment broke. We’ll try to provide more info on this at a later meeting.

TCRCD Tom McCubbins: No update.

SPI Steve DeBonis: The peer reviewed paper from Cajun James, PhD, is still pending. Cajun is available to give a presentation to this group (possibly March 17th). The other papers, related to post-fire studies, are on the SPI website. The link to the SPI website will be sent to Tussing to post on the BCWC website.

Project Review - Review projects for potential GBCWWG support

*** The proposal that Steve Tussing is writing for submittal to the FRGP is supported by this group.

VII. Closure

Action Items Summary: see items marked with *** on the preceeding pages.

Elisabeth: At the upcoming meeting on Tuesday, January 20th, 2015, we’ll see the summary of the late October rainfall event on the Battle Creek watershed by the CVRWQCB staff (Shane & Griffin). (Steve DeBonis will work with Cajun to set a date for her presentation.). We will review all of the ISSUES and prepare for voting / prioritizing at the March meeting.

*** ACTION: If your name/agency is listed as a contact on the ISSUE document http://www.battle-creek.net/docs/gbcwwg/GBCWWG_Issues_Tracking_July_14_2014.pdf, please
provide an update to Steve Tussing by December 23\textsuperscript{rd}. Steve will consolidate these updates and provide the updated document to the group (target date January 13\textsuperscript{th}) for review prior to, and at, the January 20\textsuperscript{th} meeting.

1:45 pm Meeting adjourned.