

To: Water Quality Program Staff
From: Neil Mullane, Administrator
Subject: The Watershed Approach
Date: 11/3/11

As we move forward, the Water Quality Program is going to have fewer resources, so we need to find a way to be more efficient and effective with the resources we do have. We need to continue to evolve how we deliver water program services and achieve DEQ's mission. Over the last two years we have developed a watershed approach which can greatly assist us in achieving this goal. The watershed approach will help us align our program with priorities. The watershed approach is "A coordinating framework for managing water quality that allows DEQ and our partners to build collaborative efforts to address the highest priority problems within a given watershed (modified from EPA)." Here are the key elements of the Watershed Approach Vision:

- The Watershed Approach will allow the Water Quality Program to focus and coordinate its programs to understand, address, and communicate current and prevent future water quality problems around the state. This focus will address legal, legislative and program mandates.
- The Watershed Approach will describe to communities in every watershed around the state what the Water Quality Program is doing and what our priorities are for addressing water quality problems in terms of nonpoint sources, point sources, permitting, monitoring, TMDL development and implementation plans, and grant and loan programs.
- The Watershed Approach will provide opportunities where we can engage the local community in a discussion about water quality problems and solutions.
- Implementing the Watershed Approach will be iterative, and there will be lessons learned from each assessment. This investment on our part will result in better water quality assessments, improved reporting, and the creation of opportunities to integrate our knowledge into more of our programs which will result in smarter solutions.
- The Water Quality Status and Action Plans will have a wealth of information about each basin that will identify the priority water quality concerns and the important actions that DEQ and our partners can take to "restore, maintain and enhance" water quality.
- We all need to work as or with the members of watershed teams and be prepared to provide our experience, insights, and knowledge as the teams develop Water Quality Status and Action Plans describing what is known about each basin and sets priorities.

The Watershed Approach and its importance to the current and future protection of Oregon's Water Quality

For the past eight years, the Water Quality Program has worked to organize itself around the concept of a watershed approach. We have organized our permit issuance and inspection plans on a watershed cycle. We have written a watershed permit. We have established TMDLs on watersheds and have received and reviewed TMDL implementation plans covering watersheds. We have identified the need to link the different water quality subprograms into a more coordinated delivery system. But even with all of this, we have not created a framework where we actually deliver our water quality efforts in a coordinated fashion in a single watershed.

In the Fall of 2009, we had a water quality manager's retreat where we identified the need to fully implement a watershed approach. We talked about how the consent decree for developing TMDL's would soon be met and how this would create an opportunity to align TMDL development and implementation in a way that best addressed water quality priorities around the state. We talked about the downturn in the economy and how it might impact agency resources. We visited the work we were doing on nonpoint sources and where we needed to increase our efforts to address needs around the state. We discussed the challenge of converting the permit program to a watershed cycle. We discussed how important data was to our mission and that we needed to collect more for trends, and more to identify and understand potential water quality problems around the state. We talked about the many different priorities in the different subprograms and the emergence of toxics as a driver. After all of this discussion, it became clear that the Water Quality Program needed to have a unifying mechanism for all the work performed which could integrate the many different subprograms under a single framework.

Currently, we track 17 major subprograms in the water quality operating budget. Many of these are further divided into sub-subprograms. For example, we have a monitoring subprogram as one of our 17 operating budget tracking items. But monitoring is further broken down into numerous efforts ranging from the statewide ambient sampling program looking at rivers around the state to specialized projects such as the pesticide stewardships partnership projects which examine small watersheds.

Many of the 17 major subprograms have also developed their own problem and work priorities over the years. The result is that we are a little disjointed when trying to describe the direction and priorities of the entire water quality program. Some of the best water quality program efforts in the country reside within these 17 subprograms, but we have difficulty describing how we use these subprograms to address water quality issues within specific basins.

We cannot continue to operate this way. The Water Quality Program needs to focus and coordinate its programs to understand, address, communicate current and prevent future water quality problems around the state. We can no longer spread the individual subprogram resources throughout the state and hope we are addressing the critical water quality problems.

We must make a serious effort to change how we deliver our services whether it be writing water quality standards, assessing water quality, writing permits, developing and implementing TMDLs, implementing non-point source efforts, distributing 319 grant funds, conducting inspections, responding to complaints, enforcing violations, administering the state revolving loan fund, performing 401 certifications, or other programs. We have to find a better approach to implement our program in a more effective and efficient manner or we will fail in our mission to be a leader in restoring, maintaining and enhancing the quality of Oregon's water.

This approach has to describe to communities in the different watersheds around the state what the Water Quality Program is doing in their watershed; what our priorities are for addressing water quality problems, for nonpoint sources, for point sources, for permitting, for sampling, for TMDL development and for plan implementation. Although the program started to think about the watershed approach many years ago, it is imperative that we take hold of the concept and fully implement it.

After the manager's retreat in 2009, we pursued a water quality planning grant from EPA to develop some guidance on how to create a watershed plan. I asked each region to identify one watershed in their region to develop an initial watershed plan. Eastern region got out in front of everyone by identifying the Deschutes Basin. They identified, organized and evaluated water quality data in the basin. This effort included several meetings with basin stakeholders. NWR and WR subsequently identified the North Coast Basin and Rogue Basin and began working on their initial plans. Both of these basins have completed TMDLs so some of their water quality data had been recently organized.

Marilyn Fonseca devoted some of her time to developing a draft watershed plan guidance document. However, she needed to move on to the 401 certification work for the Hells Canyon hydroelectric complex so we needed to find another person to move this effort along. Andy Schaedel agreed to help the regional teams prepare their first basin plans. As Andy began his coordination effort he asked me to describe my vision for a watershed plan. As we talked, it became apparent that I needed to find a way to focus this vision. I did so by describing in a series of questions what I would like to see answered by a watershed plan.

Some basins are rich in data and information to address these questions while others are not. My hope is that as we cycle through the state developing watershed plans, we will develop a large assessment and information base in each basin so that someday in the future we will be able to answer these questions for each basin in the state. That won't be the case when we start. We, for example, have a tremendous amount of data and information about the Deschutes Basin which the region has spent this time organizing, reviewing and sharing with stakeholders. Bonnie and Tonya have done an excellent job getting this assessment together and holding stakeholder meetings to review the information and asking for more.

I recognize that we will all try to determine what this watershed approach means and how our work as individuals fit into this broader collective effort. I know it will be hard, but we have to stop thinking as individuals within a subprogram and instead think of ourselves as members of

watershed teams prepared to provide our experience, insights and knowledge to the basin team as we describe what we know about a basin, evaluate its surface and groundwater quality, examine and write permits, develop, review and implement non-point source programs and administer grant and loan programs. We need to think of the subprograms as water quality tools that we use to protect and restore water quality and meet the goals of the Clean Water Act for fishable and swimmable waters, and treatable drinking water.

I had a wonderful time at the manager meeting in 2009 where we explored the concept of watersheds and talking about the possible ways of implementing such an approach. Each of us has an interest and professional commitment to protecting water quality. We look at water differently than most. When we drive the countryside we see the stream restoration projects where others may just see streams and trees. My wife still laughs when we pass through a town and I point out the wastewater treatment plant or the sewage outfall to the river or the places I have sampled from bridges or the various well locations around the state. We all are committed to water quality protection. So I want to see a watershed plan which conveys what we know about that basin.

A watershed plan will include:

- water quality standards and beneficial use designations,
- status of water quality conditions for surface and ground water throughout the basin,
- links to databases to get detailed water quality data,
- beneficial use impacts by pollutants from known or potential sources,
- water quality data gaps and the priorities for gathering the needed data,
- whether conditions are getting worse or improving,
- whether there are water quality standards violations,
- whether plans are being developed to meet standards and protect beneficial uses
- priorities for watershed implementation plans,
- sources identified in the implementation plans,
- locations of permitted sources, where they discharge, and whether the permits are up to date and where you could get a copy of the permit,
- identify nonpoint sources,
- critical priorities and work that address nonpoint sources,
- where DEQ is spending Section 319 grant funds to restore riparian areas,
- municipal wastewater treatment needs, any loans or grants to upgrade, receipt of loans, and project status,
- the drinking water source areas for the communities in the basin,
- compliance or enforcement actions,
- and much more.

All of this, in one document or on one web site with links to key information would paint a very good picture of what the water quality program has done, is doing, or still needs to do in a basin. You could see yourself and the work you do in this document. This can't happen overnight but we can get a good start on it. Over time it could meet this vision.

We need to answer questions communities members have about the watersheds where they live: Is it safe to swim? Are the fish safe to eat? What is being done about water quality problems in our area? Is the water safe to drink?

We are committed to developing three watershed plans per year which will include a water quality status and action plan. We have specifically described this in the 2011 Agency Request Budget for the 2011 2013 legislative session.

“Watershed basin plans: Develop watershed basin plans for three basins per year to assess water quality conditions and identify water quality priorities and actions to address problems. Examples of anticipated actions include:

- **Align water quality monitoring to basin needs**
- **Align individual permit issuance to the basin plan**
- **Align TMDL development and implementation to the basin plan**
- **Align nonpoint source implementation work to priorities in the basin**
- **Align groundwater protection work with needs outlined in the basin plan**
- **Align drinking water protection work with needs outlined in the basin plan**
- **Determine Oregon’s water quality priorities through the watershed basin plans.”**

DEQ also settled a lawsuit in July 2010 wherein we committed to develop watershed assessments to use in permit development. The primary interest of the plaintiffs was better use of available data in developing permits and identifying where additional data was needed to make well-reasoned permit decisions. This is a small part of the overall watershed basin planning approach specific to permitting but it is an additional driver for getting this work completed.

As many of you know the Executive Management Team is engaged in an effort to better manage the fundamental work of the agency. As we work through our core processes and the supporting sub processes, the watershed approach will be a key process for delivery of our water quality services. In the coming months I expect to see more and more of this unfolding in the fundamentals process.

Currently, we have completed basin assessments and action plans in the Deschutes, North Coast and Rogue basins and have moved on to the Burnt/Powder, South Coast and Clackamas/Sandy for 2011. In each region there is a team of people working on the basin assessments and action plans. Implementing the watershed approach will be iterative, and we will learn lessons from each assessment. This investment on our part will result in better water quality assessments, improved reporting, and the creation of opportunities to integrate our knowledge into more of our programs which will result in smarter solutions.

Finally, DEQ will be working much more closely with the Departments of Agriculture and Forestry in coming years to resolve nonpoint source problems. The identification of nonpoint source water quality problems and priorities will be essential for protecting and improving

Oregon's water quality in the future. Having developed clear watershed basin plans will provide a context for our review of Agriculture Water Quality Management Area Plans and help us communicate where forest operations are contributing to water quality problems.

More information about the watershed approach and links to the Water Quality Status and Action Plans are available on our internal website.

<http://deqshpnt/sites/WQ/waap/StatusAction/Wiki%20Pages/Background.aspx>

Please take a look at these plans, I think you will be as impressed as I am.

Thank you for your time.

Neil

**Klamath TMDL Implementation
Planning Discussions – Watershed Stewardship Approach**

Meeting Location and Date

Bureau of Reclamation

Klamath Basin Area Office
6600 Washburn Way
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

July 28 2011 - 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM

Call in 866-619-9667 -- Participant code 8053136

Meeting Participants:

| | |
|--|---|
| Greg Addington – Klamath Water Users Association (KWUA) | Steve Kirk - ODEQ |
| Greg Austin - USFWS | Cat Kuhlman – CA NCRWQCB |
| Glen Barrett - KWUA | Ron Larson - USFWS |
| Jason Cameron - USBR | David Leland – CA NCRWQCB |
| Rick Carlson – USBR | Tracy Liskey - Klamath Drainage District and ODA Board of Agriculture |
| Ron Cole – USFWS | Gail Louis – USEPA Region 9 |
| Clayton Creager – CA NCRWQCB | Dave Mauser - USFWS National Wildlife Refuge |
| Martha Turvey – EPA Region 10 | Tara Jane Campbell Miranda – KWUA |
| Earl Danosky – Tulelake Irrigation District | Curt Mullis – Klamath Water Users Association |
| David Ferguson – NRCS | Eric Nigg – ODEQ |
| Bob Flowers Ady Improvement Co. | Eric Nusbaum – OR Dept. of Agriculture |
| Lani Hickey – Klamath County | Jason Phillips – USBR |
| Alan Henning - EPA Region 10 | Karen Schwinn – EPA Region 9 |
| Luther Horsley - Klamath Drainage District | Mark Stuntebeck – Klamath Irrigation District |
| Nathan Jackson – Klamath Watershed Partnership | TJ Woodley - Klamath County Soil and Water Conservation District |
| Bill Kennedy – Family Farm Alliance | Ben Zabinsky – CA NCRWQCB |
| Sue Keydel – USEPA Region 9 | Kevin DeMers - USDA Rural Development and Lending |
| Konrad Fisher - Klamath Riverkeeper | Gene Foster - ODEQ |
| Rhea Graham - USBR | Heather Hendrixson – OR TNC |
| Others – This list is not meant to be exclusive. If there is someone you think should be included please provide me (ccreager@waterboards.ca.gov) with their contact information and I will send out an invitation and background information. | |
| (Confirmed Attending) (Not Yet Confirmed) (Confirmed Not Attending) | |

Meeting Overview and Purpose:

The purpose of this meeting is to begin discussions for the development of a watershed stewardship framework to address water quality issues associated with the Klamath Project and other agricultural related activities in the upper basin. This framework may involve various agreements among the participating agencies. Example agreements include the Memorandum of Agreement with US EPA , ODEQ, and the CA Regional Board for implementing the TMDL, and compliance with Oregon's TMDL rule (http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARs_300/OAR_340/340_042.html) and actions consistent with ODEQ's implementation policy (<http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/implementation.htm#gsg>). The CA TMDL Action Plan calls for the NCRWQCB to develop a Management Agency Agreement (MAA) with USBR, USFWS, and Tulelake Irrigation District (TID) regarding collaboration on improving water quality conditions. The MAA does not include ODEQ but ODEQ is seeking compliance with the Oregon TMDL rule cited above. There are also other water quality watershed stewardship initiatives within the Klamath basin (e.g., USFWS Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the refuges) that involve similar goals, objectives, and implementation measures. A high level of consistency and coordination is expected among these various agreements. Therefore the purpose of this meeting is to jointly and collaboratively develop a watershed stewardship framework that will satisfy all the desired outcomes.

Desired Outcome

The expected meeting outcomes are to:

- Identify individual interests;
- Determine common interests/goals;
- Develop a joint statement of intent to develop watershed stewardship framework that encompasses these common goals;
- Identify next steps, mechanisms and timeframe for collaborative development of a common watershed stewardship framework.

What is watershed stewardship?

According to Webster's New World Dictionary, "stewardship" is "the careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one's care." Working within the Klamath watershed context that "something" is many different things including water quality, water supply, communities, agriculture, biodiversity, fisheries, among others. This meeting is based on the notion that by practicing careful and responsible resource management that we can work together to ensure the viability of all of those resources that have been entrusted to our care.

Agenda

USBR – Klamath Basin Area Office – 6600 Washburn Way – Klamath Falls, OR

- 1) Introductions – 10:00 AM (10:00 – 10:20 am)
 - ✓ Agenda review and comments
 - ✓ General goal and desired outcomes
 - ✓ Roles – facilitator, participants, notetaker

- 2) What is watershed stewardship? What are the components of a watershed stewardship plan? (10:20 – 10:45 am)
 - a. Describe actions that will improve water quality
 - b. Develop monitoring program to track effectiveness (KBMP, KTAP)
 - c. Identify resources and schedules for actions
 - d. Manage adaptively – feedback loops from monitoring; new science, etc.

- 3) Review ongoing initiatives (10:45 am – 12 noon)

Suggested presentation format: (1) genesis/context/authority; (2) purpose; (3) status – funding and timeframes; (4) water quality improvement activities that would fit into watershed stewardship plan

- ✓ Klamath Basin Monitoring Program (Rick Carlson)
- ✓ KHSA
 - Interim Measure 10 (Clayton Creager),
 - Interim Measure 11 (Clayton Creager)
 - Interim Measure 15 (Rick Carlson)
- ✓ KBRA (TBD)
- ✓ USFWS Comprehensive Conservation Plan (Greg Austin, FWS)
- ✓ ESA - Sucker Recovery Plan (Ron Larson, FWS)
- ✓ USBR Activities (Jason Cameron, USBR)

- ✓ Klamath Tracking And Accounting Program (Nathan Jackson, KWP)
- ✓ Klamath Watershed Partnership (Nathan Jackson, KWP)
- ✓ Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (Steve Kirk)
- ✓ TMDLs (Steve Kirk)
- ✓ CA Irrigated Agriculture Waiver Program – Ben Zabinsky
- ✓ Others – the intent of this agenda item is to have each participating entity identify individual interests, comment on common goals, and identify areas of possible collaboration.

LUNCH (on your own)

(12 noon – 1 pm)

4) Discussion

- Identify Areas of Common Stewardship Objectives and Actions
- Identify Obstacles to Watershed Stewardship Framework

5) Action Items and Next steps for:

- a) including stakeholder groups and other participating agencies.

(Break @ 2:30 pm)

- b) Schedule for Developing Agreements

Adjourn – 4:00 PM

If agencies or organizations would like to share your stewardship objectives prior to the meeting, please send them along and I'll ensure that they are distributed to the list of invited participants. Attached below is a summary of California's TMDL MAA action item to facilitate discussion regarding the development of the MAA and other possible agreements.

CA NCRWQCB TMDL Action Plan MAA Summary

Develop and implement a Management Agency Agreement (MAA) between USBR, USFWS, TID, and the Regional Water Board that addresses the water quality impacts of the USBR's Klamath Project. The MAA should include the following action items:

- Complete a water quality study based on best available science to characterize the seasonal and annual nutrient and organic matter loading through USBR's Klamath Project and refuges. The study should be completed in time to inform the development of a water quality management plan described in the following bullet.
- Based on the results of the water quality study, develop a water quality management plan to meet and/or offset the Lower Lost River and Klamath River TMDL allocations. The plan should be submitted to the Regional Water Board for approval by [insert date that is 18 months after this Amendment takes effect].
- Include a schedule with interim milestones for meeting the TMDL allocations and targets;
- Coordinate implementation actions with other responsible parties discharging pollutants within USBR's Klamath Project and refuges;
- Develop a monitoring and reporting program with the Regional Water Board to evaluate the effectiveness of management measures and track progress towards meeting the Lower Lost River and Klamath River TMDL allocations and targets;
- Coordinate with the Klamath River water quality improvement tracking and accounting program in implementing offset projects; and
- Periodically report to the Regional Water Board on actions taken to implement the TMDL and progress towards meeting the TMDL allocations and targets.
- Timeline - Complete the MAA by June 2011 (recognized that this is not likely).

Watershed Stewardship Approach - Klamath Falls Meeting

USBR – Klamath Basin Area Office

6600 Washburn Way

Klamath Falls, OR

July 28, 2011

10:00AM-4:00PM

Purpose: Begin discussions among stakeholders regarding the development of a watershed stewardship framework to address water quality issues in the upper Klamath Basin.

1) Introductions – 10:00 AM *(10:00 – 10:20 am)*

- ✓ Agenda review and comments
- ✓ General goal and desired outcomes

2) What is watershed stewardship? *(10:20 – 10:45 am)*

According to Webster's New World Dictionary, "stewardship" is "the careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one's care." Working within the Klamath watershed context that "something" is many different things including water quality, water supply, communities, agriculture, biodiversity, fisheries, among others. This meeting is based on the notion that by practicing careful and responsible resource management that we can work together to ensure the viability of all of those resources that have been entrusted to our care.

- a. What are the components of a watershed stewardship plan?
- b. Describe actions that will improve water quality
- c. Develop monitoring program to track effectiveness (KBMP, KTAP)
- d. Identify resources and schedules for actions
- e. Manage adaptively – feedback loops from monitoring; new science, etc.

3) Review ongoing initiatives *(10:45 am – 12:20 noon)*

- ✓ Klamath Basin Monitoring Program - Rick Carlson (see KBMP handout 07282011)
- ✓ KHSA
 - Interim Measure 10 - Clayton Creager
 - Interim Measure 11 - Clayton Creager
 - Interim Measure 15 - Rick Carlson
- ✓ KBRA - Jon Hicks - USBR
- ✓ USFWS Comprehensive Conservation Plan - Greg Austin, FWS
- ✓ ESA - Sucker Recovery Plan - Ron Larson, FWS
- ✓ USBR Activities - Jason Cameron, USBR
- ✓ Klamath Tracking And Accounting Program - Nathan Jackson, KWP
- ✓ Klamath Watershed Partnership - Nathan Jackson, KWP
- ✓ Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board - Steve Kirk (see OWEB handout 07282011)
- ✓ TNC (Heather)
- ✓ TMDLs
 - ODEQ - Steve Kirk, Eric Nigg;
 - CA – Clayton Creager
- ✓ CA Irrigated Agriculture Waiver Program – David Leland

- ✓ Klamath County - Stan Strickland (see Klamath County handout 07282011 handout)
- ✓ ODA – Eric Nusbaum - (see ODA Water Quality Program handout 07282011)
- ✓ Soil and Water Conservation - TJ Woodley
- ✓ NRCS – TJ Woodley

4) Discussion

Identify Areas of Common Stewardship Objectives and Actions
Identify Obstacles to Watershed Stewardship Framework

5) Action Items and Next steps for:

- a) Including stakeholder groups and other participating agencies.
- b) Schedule for Developing Agreements

Facilitator (Sue Keydel – USEPA Region 9) Meeting Flip Chart Notes

Notes RE: Objectives

1. How to measure progress (Watershed Stewardship vs. TMCLs).
 - a. Land condition? Water column monitoring?
 - b. Focus on Action/Practices, not numbers.
2. CA's Irrigated Agriculture Program not ready yet- will use permits, WDRs, and waivers.
3. Land use management plan: Klamath County and TMDL Implementation
4. Permits for Refuges needed
5. Creditability of targets
 - a. Focus on actions on the ground and plans.
 - b. "What do you want me to do?"- relate this to improvements.
6. Getting started.
 - a. "Too big" to be achievable
 - b. Need for tangible results
 - c. Money
7. Agricultural community has already done a lot; how to do more?
8. Selling Watershed Stewardship Framework
 - a. Its "more right"
 - b. Bbig sales job/educational outreach to do.
9. Cost of projects and where does the money come from.
10. Uncertainty of KBRA and its projects.
11. Lack of clarity for DMAs regarding their role.
 - a. Just Irrigation districts? (what about others?)
 - b. Control land use?
12. Watershed Stewardship calls for distributed responsibility. How do we manage that?

Notes RE: Opportunities

1. Encourage participation via flexibility at the local level.
2. Begin by doing what we can

3. Use the Adaptive Management Feedback loop
4. Agricultural Community –
 - a. process/conservation has been ongoing;
 - b. they know the best management for their land.
5. Focus on how we do better, do less and learn (don't focus on the numbers)/targets.
6. How to address the “un-owned” legacy problems (e.g., UKL sediments).
7. Demonstrating coordination amongst stakeholders will help in pulling in support.
8. DMAs can frame what their contribution is.
9. Keeping water in Lost Basin has multiple benefits:
 - a. water to refuges
 - b. less energy pumping

Notes RE: Stewardship

- What is relationship to other issues such as TMDLs, Waivers, WDRs...?
- Is it feasible and worthwhile to create Watershed Stewardship framework layer - more to work on and coordinate.
- Already have large monitoring program ongoing – use it to support monitoring impact analysis and adaptive management.

Notes RE: Questions & Comments

1. What Geographic area is involved?
 - a. Original group was upper Basin near Klamath Project.
 - b. Future of Watershed Stewardship Framework is growing and T.B.D.
2. Memorandum of Agreement/Agencies.
 - a. is it part of Watershed Stewardship Framework,
 - b. Could Watershed Stewardship Framework fulfilled MAA requirement to CA TMDL?
 - c. T.B.D.
3. Legacy pollutants –
 - a. What are they? (e.g., nutrient loads in UKL sediments)
 - b. How do/could addressing them fit into Watershed Stewardship Framework?
4. TMDL requirements need coordination between OR and CA Monitoring coordination with rest of monitoring in Basin?
 - a. USGS monitoring of UKL/?
5. Will KHSA Interim Measure-10 Recommendations be subject to peer review?
6. What is the effect of KBRA uncertainty on W.S. Framework and related activities?
 - a. KBRA would accelerate W.Q. (Fisheries) beneficial works.
 - b. What are effects on implementation and phasing of work?
 - c. Uncertainties related to irrigation, W.Q. in various areas.
7. Wetlands as part of restoration process
 - a. Can we use existing wetlands (refuges) (e.g. IM-10/11)?
 - b. Can treatment wetlands be designed to support “ducks” (waterfowl in refuges)?
8. Concerns with huge projects not being adaptive - need to maintain adaptability.
9. Need input from:
 - a. Klamath Tribes
 - b. Soil and water Conservation District

- c. ODA
 - d. NRCS
 - e. Klamath County
 - f. USGS
10. Watershed Stewardship vs. KBRA management structure
 - a. A lot of parallel tracks
 - b. Regulatory vs. voluntary
 - c. KBRA has project prioritization process (?)
 11. How might Klam-TAP not work?
 12. Klam TAP-
 - a. Does credit extend beyond year given?
 - b. how long are credits good for?
 13. What TMDLs/CA want
 - a. BMPs instead of achieving a condition?
 - b. An owner's understanding is best
 - c. Encouraging owners create nutrient/dairy management plans
 14. Form CA/OR Consistency Optimization Subgroup: (ODA, Ag Water Quality, NCRWQCB, water users)?
 15. CA's North Coast RB: The Klamath Basin includes the last areas in CA without agricultural permits – (Scott and Shasta are the exception to this).
 16. Do TMDLs focus on where and when water returns to the river?

Notes RE: Next Steps

1. Minutes from meeting – Clayton to compile and distribute
2. Recommendations – participants submit ideas to Clayton Creager
3. Next regrouping (call, WebEx...?)
4. Participants should think about what stewardship could do for you.
 - a. Give an up or down vote for continuing the conversation.
5. Follow up
 - a. Get Ag program folks together

Notes RE: Acronyms

1. KHSA: Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement
2. MAA: Memorandum of Agreement/Agencies - required in CA TMDL to be between RWQCB, USBR, and TID.
3. KBMP: Klamath Basin Monitoring Program: basin-wide collaboration of many programs
4. KBRA: Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement
5. CCP: Comprehensive Restoration Plan - for USFWS Refuges
6. KlamTAP: Klamath Tracking and Accounting Program
7. SIP: Special Investment Partnerships
8. DMA: Designated Management Agencies (ODEQ TMDL Responsible Entities)
9. BMPs: Best Management Practices

Meeting Attendance Record

Date: July 28, 2011 **Time:** 10:00AM-4:00pm **Location:** Klamath Falls, OR

| Name | Email | Organization | Phone Number |
|---|---|--|---|
| Clayton Creager | ccreager@waterboards.ca.gov | NCRWQCB | 707-546-2666 |
| Jason Cameron | jcameron@usbr.gov | U.S. Bureau of Reclamation | 541-880-2563 |
| David Leland | dlelnad@waterboards.ca.gov | NCRWQCB | 707-576-2069 |
| Susan Keydel | keydel.susan@epa.gov | U.S. EPA R9 | 415-972-3106 |
| Ken Fetcho | kfetcho@yuroktribe.nsn.us | Yurok Tribe | 707-954-1523 |
| Rick Carlson | racarlson@usbr.gov | U.S.BR | 541-880-2562 |
| Eric Nusbaum | enusbaum@oda.state.or.us | ODA | 541-846-6424 |
| Bill Kennedy | | Lost Rim WAC | 541-891-1794 |
| Ron Larson | ron_larson@fus.gov | USFUS | 541-885-2506 |
| Jason Phillips | jphillips@usbr.gov | BOR | 541-880-2544 |
| Steve Kirk | kirk.steve@deq.state.or.us | ODEQ | 541-633-2023 |
| Jon Hicks | jhicks@usbr.gov | USBR | 541-880-2561 |
| Catherine Kuhlman | ckuhlman@waterboards.ca.gov | NCWQCB | 707-696-7180 |
| S.R. Strickland | sstrick@co.klamath.or.us | Klamath County Public Works | 541-883-4696 |
| Lani Hickey | lhickey@co.klamath.or.us | Klamath County | 541-883-4696 |
| Tracey Liskey | traceywe@AOL.com | Rancher | 541-891-1531 |
| Cart Mullis | ctm8605@aol.com | KWUA | 541-892-8447 |
| Nathan Jackson | njackson@klamathpartnership.org | Klamath Watershed Partnership | 541-850-1717 |
| Tara Jane Campbell Miranda | tara@kwua.org | KWUA | 541-883-6100 |
| Heather Hendrixson | whendrixson@tnc.org | The Nature Conservancy | 541-273-0789x3 |
| Greg Addington | greg@kwua.org | KWUA | 541-883-6100 |
| Erica Terence | erica@klamathriver.org | Klamath River Keeper | 530-627-3311 |
| Paul Simmons | psimmons@somachlaw.com | SSD/ KWUA | 916-446-7979 |
| Brad Kirby | tid@cot.net | Tulelake Irrigation District | 530-667-2249 |
| T.J. Woodley | tj.woodley@OACD.org | Klamath SWCD | 541-883-6932 |
| Dee Samson Greg Austin Earl Danosky Brad Kubea (?) | red_dee@cot.net Greg_Austin@fws.gov tid@cot.net (?) | Lava Reds- Bute Valley RCD USFWS Tulelake Irrigation District (?) | 530-667-4247x110 530-667-2231 530-667-2249 (?) |
| Teleconference Participants | | | |
| Gene Foster | FOSTER.Eugene@deq.state.or.us | ODEQ | 503-229-5325 |
| Eric Nigg | NIGG.Eric@deq.state.or.us | ODEQ | 541-633-2035 |
| Crystal Bowman | cbowman@karuk.us | Karuk Tribe – WQ Program | 530-469-3456 |
| Martha Turvey | turvey.martha@epa.gov | USEPA Region 10 | 206-553-1354 |
| Ben Zabinsky | bzabinsky@waterboards.ca.gov | CA NCRWQCB | 707-576-6750 |
| Rhea Graham | rgraham@usbr.gov | USBR | 916-704-8865 |
| Rachel_Esralew | Rachel_esralew@fws.gov | USFWS | 916-278-9420 |