

CVPIA Program Review

Stakeholder Meeting

Tuesday, February 14, 2006

Media Inquiries

Jeff McCracken, Public Affairs for the Bureau of Reclamation noted that he had received media calls regarding the CVPIA Program Review. Michael Doyle and Mark Grossi of the McClatchy newspapers in DC and of the Fresno Bee had called for information. The article would appear on Wednesday, February 15. The group reaffirmed their intent to keep the process open and seek and invite other individuals and organizations who need to be engaged.

Additional Participation

The group agreed to the following actions to invite additional participants:

Campbell, Susan	Dept of Fish and Game, NMFS
Serge	Bill Gaines, California Waterfowl Association

Zeke Grader of PCFFA is planning to attend either Friday, February 17 or meetings the following week.

Assessment Matrix Questions & Definitions

Common Questions to address for each program activity

- What type of activity is described by the Act?
- Are there specific actions described in the Act?
- Is there a metric described in the Act?
- What type of purpose is described in the Act?
- Is there a purpose described in the Act?
- Is there a metric for the outcome defined in the Act?

Definitions for Consideration

Program Activity = the program management for provisions in the Act

Action = the implementation tasks for each Program Activity

Output = the actions implemented by the CVPIA Program

Metric = the measurement of outputs or outcomes

Outcome = the purpose or results of the activity

Program = A combination of actions to produce outcomes

Performance Goals = Combined metric, target, and timeframe for either Outcomes or Outputs

PART Review

Dept of the Interior to work with Office of Management & Budget to complete review

Results of PART Review to be included with 2008 Presidential budget (February 2007)

Recommendations for improvement will be included in results

Matrix Review

The group reviewed Program Activities in two categories (Preliminary Complete and Needs Further Discussion) to complete the matrix categories for documenting what is defined by the

CVPIA Program Review

Act. The following are questions and discussion for each of the program activities discussed. With the completion of this discussion, the group has completed the first pass filling out information defined in the Act for each program activity.

Preliminary Complete

b (6) Shasta TCD

- Is there another type of fish protection besides temperature control?
- Act says install temperature control
- Act says implement modifications
- Outcome of act is to double fish, not control temperature
The Act does not actually describe an outcome metric for Shasta TCD

b (17)ACID

- No specific action beyond developing program
- Act does not say exactly what to implement in the program
- Develop and implement a program without further direction

b (19) Reservoir Storage

- language of the Act says investigate
- review must capture reality for investigation, including the implementation
- Implementation is part of the interpretation
- Implementation is part of the assessment where conditions have been met
- Output metric is whether investigation was completed
- The act says maintain operations and add more capacity
- If the purpose is fisheries, a metric is not defined
- Storage is not a fisheries metric, storage would be the output metric
- How do we know it has been implemented? Because we maintain minimal levels of storage
- Minimum carryover storage is a known quantity which then triggers other actions
- The dual purpose of fisheries & carryover storage makes this fit into the outcome side
- Act implies it will be implemented
- Development and implementation is defined at the Program level
- Metric is carryover storage

b (22) Ag Waterfowl

- Develop program and develop incentives
- Is the metric how big are the incentives?
- There may be other measurements
- No indication in Act about specific direction: regional, habitat, seasonal focus for flooding incentives – no where, when, size specified in the Act
- With the purpose to keep water in stream, there is less need to release water
 - Better for habitat, water supply and power
- “Yield enhancement” for water supply
- Was this only an incentive program?
- Was this funded through operations instead of Restoration Fund
- No outcome metric is here because the program as it is specified does not specify measurement

CVPIA Program Review

d (6) Private wetlands

- Is there any activity here other than a report?
- The report becomes the output and the outcome is not applicable
- The issues were identified without further action specified as a result of the report

(e) Supporting Investigations

The output and metrics are similar to d(6) private wetlands

Need Further Discussion

b (1) AFRP

- The Act describes this as a program, with no actions specified, except to make all reasonable effort

b (1) Other – Other CVP Impacts)

- On its own it is not a program (it is a subset of AFRP), called a measure instead
- Measures could be programs that are not defined

b (2) Dedicated project yield

- Dedicate and manage is a special type of action
- Congress specified action to be implemented
- The important point is to meet minimum requirement for ESA to reach a productive outcome
- No language in the Act to specify how the 800,000 acre feet is to be used
- The Act does specify for providing tools for the state to meet its legal obligations
- The Act appears to give flexibility for users so they can choose to use water however it is most needed

b (3) Water acquisition

- Cannot be independent of b(1) and b(2)
- No plan is required and the program did not become a plan
- In this provision of the Act, what is happening at the program level?
- Activity is defined as acquiring water. Acquiring water is at the program level.
- Has a specific activity been identified and how was it established? The measure does not state how much water or where it will be released
- Coordination is needed with the realization that b(1), b(2)and b(3) are interdependent

b (5) Contra Costa

- Is this an measure or program?
- Something here is specifically defined, so it appears to be a measure/acquisition

b (7) Flow Standards

- Sounds like a management directive, involving meeting standards
- This looks like it can stand alone in its own category – compliance

b (8) Short Pulses

- Currently implemented on CVP streams
- There are several ways to measure fish outcomes – the Act doesn't define outcome measures

CVPIA Program Review

d (9) Flow Fluctuation Study

- Is this a study?
- Does the Act request more information at a later time
- The Act does not specify how many fish are lost as a result of flow
- Fish can be lost in other ways, unrelated to flow

b (11) Coleman

- Plan has evolved and been amended
- All construction is complete
- Serge will bring to next meeting the specific document related to this provision of the Act
- The purpose of trapping is to help natural fish and endangered species, not to aid the hatchery's efforts
- There is a trench where fish can be trapped
- The purpose is to reduce diseases of fish at hatcheries and the natural fish

b (12) Clear Creek

- This provision is about restoration of wetlands and habitats to create a viable and sustainable population
- How is restoration defined? Developing a restoration plan is at the program level.
- The Act does not define restoration
- There are specific measures to bring in spawning gravel. The riparian habitat actions are undefined
- Are these actions conducted under b(1) for instream and riparian habitat?
- Spawning gravel may imply a habitat

b (14) Delta Cross Channel

- What is the status of this? The group thinks this is still being studied
- Has the study resulted in an operations plan or an ongoing plan?
- The focus of this provision is on striped bass, linking the benefits to striped bass is not an obvious step
- The reality is that salmon are being addressed and there is little interest in striped bass
- This is being operated in conjunction with Tracy to help water flows there

b (15) Old River Barrier

- Is this permanent or temporary? The Act does not specify
- No specific actions for implementation are specified

b (16) Camp

- Is there a biological outcome possible here from the assessment itself?
- Need biological results and effectiveness

b (20) GCID

- Similar to Tracy Pumping Plant
- Considered as a new way to purchase a fish screen
- Began with 22 alternatives and focused down on one
- This project was not funded with Restoration Funds
- Facility is complete and operational

CVPIA Program Review

b (21) AFSP

- Screens are not the outcome
- Fish can be prioritized by size, stream, location as another way to measure outcome
- Includes a number of programs and a little of each of them has been completed
- What are other measurement strategies?

b (23) Trinity River

- A narrow program to measure flows, implement flows
- The Act provides for doing the study and nothing more
- With a focus on the habitat side, population numbers are listed as goals

c(2) Stanislaus

- What are the basin needs?
- What importance is the Record of Decision?
- This wound up as a CalFed program, as have others

d (5) San Joaquin Basin Action Plan

- Very specific reference to the Delta Estuary
- Construction, acquisition
- d (2) supports the processes in d (5)

(g) Eco/Water Ops Models

- Primarily focused on models and data
- Full data collection is in process

3408 (i) Water Conservation

- Look at various measurements to assess goals
- Does water supply need to be an end in itself?
- What about crop yield?

3408 (j) Water Augmentation

- Closely linked to Water Conservation

Participants

~~Ara Azhderian~~ — ~~SLDMWA~~
~~Serge Birk~~ — ~~CVPWA~~
~~Briece 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