

Subject: NMFS Central Valley Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Planning Workshops

From: "Kelly W. Sackheim" <kws@sackheimconsult.com>

Date: Wed, 23 May 2007 15:42:34 -0700

To: Diane.Windham@NOAA.GOV

CC: Whitmore Bob <rjroth@frontiernet.net>, dick@davis.com, Glenn Dye <tdye526780@frontiernet.net>, diane_96096@charter.net, rising-eagle@prodigy.net, kelly@westernshastarc.org, san3@pge.com, cow1@pge.com, pfk1@pge.com, klilienb@ch2m.com, rmull@co.shasta.ca.us, SGoodwin@Vestra.com, steve.edmondson@noaa.gov, Kelly Catlett <kcatlett@friendsoftheriver.org>, bjohnson@tu.org, cbonham@tu.org, David.k.white@noaa.gov, Richard.wantuck@noaa.gov, eric.theiss@noaa.gov, mberry@dfg.ca.gov, Brenda_olson@fws.gov, William_foster@fws.gov, amanji@dfg.ca.gov

Diane - We were very pleased to participate in yesterday's productive workshop. We hope our comments were useful. The selection of Recovery Actions requires knowledge of site-specific conditions and evaluation of action options for intended and secondary effects.

We will try to assist in integrating your Recovery Planning practices into the license surrender process of PG&E for the FERC licensed P-606 Kilarc-Cow Project. The project has developments on the Old Cow and South Cow Creeks in the Cow Creek Watershed. We observe from the tables of "Stressors by Life Stage" for Rivers without Large Dams, for Chinook (Salmon), Cow Creek was not specifically identified, but for Steelhead, "water temperature" in Cow Creek was cited among the top stressors for every single life stage.

We believe that it will be important to consider the net effects on Steelhead of the variety of options available for disposition of the hydro project facilities upon license surrender. For example, one option that must be considered is decommissioning and removal of all project facilities, including the structures that divert water from Old Cow Creek. Returning substantially higher flows to the by-pass reach could augment habitat at the expense of raising water temperatures experienced in existing habitat downstream, because the project apparently serves to maintain colder water temperatures by holding the water at a higher elevation for a longer period of time. We will be recommending additional studies as part of the license surrender process to evaluate the net effect on Steelhead of each alternative.

We look forward to being part of continued progress made toward Salmon and Steelhead Recovery.

Sincerely,

Kelly Sackheim and Richard Ely
Davis Hydro / Davis Wind / The Davis Collaborative
27264 Meadowbrook Dr., Davis CA 95618
530 753-8864 Fax 530 753-4707 kwh@davis.com
TheDavisCollaborative.com - www.DavisHydro.com

Whitmore Bob wrote:

Thanks. Will figure out something to say in an e-filing using your suggestions.

Also need suggestions for information I should provide to our local Recovery Workshop. I attended the one here last year.

See the pasted email about this issue.

My original email:

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Redding, May 24 workshop
Date:Fri, 18 May 2007 10:11:38 -0700
From:Whitmore Bob <rjroth@frontiernet.net>
To:Diane.Windham@NOAA.GOV

D. Windham: Thanks for notice, am registered.

Question 1: Have checked website shown below, unable to find summaries for Northern California?

<http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/recovery/index.htm>., along w/ summaries from the threats workshops held last July/August 2006.

I reside in an area proposed for Salmon/Steelhead protection, Cow Creek Watershed-Eastern Shasta County. Also a member of Shasta Trinity Fly Fishers-Conservation Committee (also monitor and attend meetings of the Battle Creek Watershed Restoration Group), Cow Creek Watershed Management Group (CCWMG), Friends of the Cow Creek Preserve (dedicated to obtaining and conserving local PG&E lands through the Stewardship Council).

USFWS did a video study of main stem Cow Creek in the Fall of 2006. Almost 4,200 Salmon were counted. Local groups are already working to protect the streams in our area.

Question 2: Would it be possible for us to bring handout material or contact information of the area.?

Sincerely,

RJ Roth
PO Box 116
Whitmore, CA, 96096
530.472.3843

Here is her reply, since she didn't say no will need to come up with material to have available or present if I get a chance. Suggestions please, maps, CCWMG documents of work already done or proposed?

Also notice she does not mention Salmon. Oversight or?

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Re: Redding, May 24 workshop
Date:Fri, 18 May 2007 13:27:32 -0700
From:Diane Windham <Diane.Windham@NOAA.GOV>
To:Whitmore Bob <rjroth@frontiernet.net>
References:<464DDE4A.50001@frontiernet.net>

Hi Bob,

Thanks for getting in touch and glad you'll be coming to the workshop. You are correct, the summaries aren't posted yet - the threats assessment process has been quite labor intensive and has kept me from posting the summaries. We will be going over that information at the

workshop, however, and explaining how the threats workshops outputs are being incorporated into the overall assessment. I apologize.

Regarding Cow Creek information, we are definitely considering Cow Cr for Central Valley steelhead recovery actions, so if the fall-run study you referred to included steelhead information, we could really use that. Let me know and we can figure out how best to exchange information.

Thanks so much,
Regards,
Diane

T. Diane Windham
Recovery Coordinator

National Marine Fisheries Service
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 8-300
Sacramento, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 930-3600