

# **CVPIA Program Review**

## **Stakeholder Meeting**

Tuesday, February 7, 2006

### **Action Items Review**

#### **Environmental/Fishing Interest Participation**

- Contacts made, work in progress

#### **Purpose Statement**

- Process Title: CVPIA Program Review
- Draft Purpose Statement on Thursday

#### **Scope of Evaluation**

- Program activities list is consistent with the language of 3407 (a)
- Shana will update the list of program activities

### **Assessment Matrix**

The group reviewed the assessment matrix and suggested the following refinements:

- Timeframe – This column should consider whether there a closure mechanism
- At program level – define timeframe for outputs and outcomes
- Broad acceptance should be changed to consider any barriers to implementation, including acceptance, financial resources, and other factors to consider
- Add yes/no for output, targets and timeframes
- At program level, define outputs and outcomes
- Include the narrative to further describe outputs and outcomes – let patterns emerge. Need the narrative to share information with others outside the room

The group reviewed three program activities and identified the following additional notes:

#### **Red Bluff**

- Outcome defined – fish passage problems
- Outcome is defined by a fish passage metric, an operational number such a 200 CFS
- Outcome for water use assumed
- No targets & timeframes
- Program Level – actions developed, most have been implemented

#### **Shasta TCD**

- Purpose is to protect and move fish
- Outcome – to assistance temperature in upper Sacramento River
- Outcome defined – build it

#### **Level 4 Refuge Supply**

- Outcome = habitat
- Output = acre-feet of water
- Target for the output is defined

## CVPIA Program Review

- Timeframe- this program will continue in perpetuity

### Parking Lot

#### Timelines – Notes for Further Discussion

- Do some program activities continue in perpetuity?
- Is there a need to continue to implement measures
- Is a closure mechanism defined?
- Is it possible to sunset out developing measures?
- Is ‘done’ when measures are implemented?
- Is there ever completion if the goal/outcome is not achieved?
- Long term measure is solving the measure, not solving new problems or new measures
- Consider if the impact being addressed has a timeframe?
- Timeframe for implementation of actions may not be the same

#### Program Management Issues

The group identified the following issues and questions for discussion when we develop steps to completion:

- Program managers need workplans for performance goals
- No agreement on performance goals
- Workplan needs to define completion for developing performance goals
- How decisions are made within each agency differs
- “Make reasonable efforts” to perform

### Next Meetings

Thursday, February 09, 2006, 1:00 to 4:00 pm

Tuesday, February 14, 2006, 9:00 am to 4:00 pm

### Participants

Ara Azhderian — SLDMWA  
Serge Birk — CVPWA  
~~Brice Bledsoe — CCWD~~  
Frances Brewster — SCVWD  
~~Richard Denton — CCWD~~  
~~Lynn Hurley — SCVWD~~  
~~Marianne Guerin — CCWD~~  
~~Kellye Kennedy — SCVWD~~  
~~Paul Olmstead — SMUD~~  
Jeff Phipps — NCPA  
Jeff Quimby — CCWD  
Robert Stackhouse — CVPWA  
Bernice Sullivan — FWA  
~~Jerry Toenyas — NCPA~~  
Alan Zepp — NCPA

~~John Engbring — FWS~~  
Charles Gardiner — Facilitator  
~~Roger Guinee — FWS~~  
Susan Hoffman — Reclamation  
Campbell Ingram — FWS  
Shana Kaplan — Reclamation  
Susan Ramos — Reclamation  
Janice Kelley — Support