

CVPIA Program Review Summary

Working Group Meeting

Tuesday, March 28, 2006

Ground Rules

The Working Group reviewed the ground rules. At least one participant felt that the ground rule for representing the group positively externally was an unreasonable constraint on external communication. The group agreed that all interests have external audiences to report to, but could not agree on the ground rule for external communication.

April 24 Congressional Hearing

Stakeholders from the Working Group who attended the hearing highlighted key points of discussion. Congressional members directed questions to a panel and individuals regarding the general CVPIA process, timelines, possible changes to law, how Restoration funding is being used, contract pricing, contracting, and additional storage. Discussion about CVPIA PAR, process and timeline was minimal.

Working Group Process Update

Working Group reviewed the steps necessary to complete review process. Shana distributed an updated schedule of tasks. In working through the review process, the Working Group acknowledged that many programs need to be considered in relationship with others as a way of identify the progress toward goals and completion.

Refuge programs

d(1) Refuge Level 2

Refer to outcome goals in referenced report.

Are you looking at habitat goals and working with refuge managers?

Looking at outcomes is a good exercise.

Be careful not to spend extensive resources on outcomes.

How are you documenting the results?

Will you look at barriers to meeting goals?

Focus on barriers to getting water – such as physical or other constraints.

What are refuge managers doing currently and what is achievable with full water supply?

Is water metered? Reclamation has records of progress of getting water to refuges – there are some differences in delivery levels between refuges.

d(2) Refuge Level 4

Change “water service contracts” to “water supply contracts.”

Identify the difference between water service and water supply.

Supply is specifically identified in the water supply contracts.

What is target for L4? Five service contracts.

This is an ongoing process - no timeframe stated.

CVPIA Program Review Summary

This provision changed from measure to program.

How are we defining “Program?”

Capture program linkages in “supporting provisions” – program activities are managed together d(1) and d(2) and (3), (4), (5) are related and need to move to supporting provision column.

Place measurement at Act level and define “Program” at program level.

Are there any refugees listed in d(2) that are not listed in the opening of (d)?

Check language in d(4) timeframe description – “per Act...”

Need to get clearer definitions.

d(5) Wheeling

Agreements do not relate to habitat, they relate to volume and conveyance of water.

Outcome should be acre-feet delivery not habitat.

Outcome = Wheeling Agreements, not output.

Show linkage to L2 and L4 outcomes.

Does wheeling include d(1) and/or d(2) water?

Language assumes that d(1) is included in d(2).

How does level 2 water arrive? Is this level d(4) also?

Does Wheeling include level 2 and level 4.

Act-level timeframe should show a separate timeframe for d(1) and for all d(5)

How do you set a target?

Outcome should = volume of water delivered.

Output = contacts? Is it relevant?

Is the program wheeling **all** the water? What is the amount?

How much water does the program need to wheel?

How do you deal with the prohibition language on certain actions?

Linkage referring to b(3) the authority for funding, d(5) wheeling and construction.

d(5) Construction

Change Act reference to “directed to construct” instead of “acquire.”

The outcome is water supply.

d(5) has no reference to wells as a water source – either acquisition or construction.

San Joaquin Basin Plan needs goals for habitat restoration.

Outcome = acres of habitat restored in San Joaquin.

For different types of activities, goals may be appropriately output or outcome, depending on the situation.

Put all Act quotes in Matrix in quote marks.

Note quotations when appropriate.

Fisheries

b(1) AFRP

Note date of CALFED documents. Can they be considered supporting evidence, if they come after the Act?

Two lines for programs, one row is plan the other is the implementation for restoration actions in plan, Why? Can rows be combined?

CVPIA Program Review Summary

Clarify the terminology – implementation of action.

Different timeframe and targets for each.

Is the doubling plan CVPIA-wide? Does it apply to all streams? Or specific streams?

Remove assessment of actual completion of plan.

Modify language in Program implementation – not just “construction.”

Outcome Target: add “number of...”

Why is the Chinook salmon text included?

Add striped bass, steelhead, salmon, sturgeon, shad.

Act intends to mitigate issues.

Need to capture that the Act says “make all reasonable efforts” to double.

Sustainability is key focus of attention.

Add linkage to other (b) provisions.

How do we include the link to b(1)(c)?

Are all 286 actions defined as “all reasonable efforts”?

How do we allow adaptive management into the target?

Plan does not tell what reasonable effort is.

Avoid the word “completion;” it has too much “finality.” Use progress or implementation to avoid confusion around completion instead.

b(12) Clear Creek

Supporting notes- Act calls for DFG to do flow studies. What is the role of DFG in the studies?

- Fish & wildlife service are already doing studies.
- An analysis was performed done in 1986 – Jeff has report.

Instream Flow Incremental Methodology (IFIM) is not necessary (or cost effective) for determining flows. It will not add value or new results to current identification of flow needs.

Metric description should be cubic feet per second not acre-feet, consistency with b(2).

Act said fish ladder and dam was removed. A fish ladder or screen not needed.

Adaptive Management report timeframe says annually until 2010. Need to clarify meaning.

Adaptive Management should be the next tier down, it is not appropriate at this level. Should be a part of all/most programs.

It is not a measure of success, it is a tool.

Fish passage has been funded by CALFED panel.

Adaptive management here was model for other AFRP Programs – link to ERP in supporting provisions. More ambitious to be done than what is done in CVPIA.

Outcome = fisheries and habitat.

Add “Supplemental flows are provided by b(2),” not all the flows.

Gravel supplementation. Why isn't this part of the b(13) gravel program in terms of funding?

Target column should be numerical instead of “cost effective” projects.

Need specifics defined.

b(13) Spawning Gravel

Timeframe: Is annually the correct word? Is it periodically? The evaluation is annual, the task may be less often.

Clarify additional limitations on each river – geographic reaches may create inherent barriers

This is linked to AFRP outcome.

Is the outcome activity linked, or related, or supportive instead?

CVPIA Program Review Summary

Program managers support AFRP. Can they measure contributions?
Do we need to reference AFRP or add a line/row for riparian habitat outcomes?

Miscellaneous & other

b(16) CAMP

Purpose type: Information/report/evaluation.

Need a better metric that is more closely tied to a purpose or outcome.

Outcome metric is not the number of fish, etc. Data is the outcome. There is no metric.

Outputs – assessment, modeling, reports and recommendations.

CAMP is not assessing **each** program activity – it is an investigation of overall results of program by grouping.

Each program is responsible for assessing its own program.

b(18) Striped Bass

Is there a closure mechanism?

Is it is not closed, how do we develop a performance goal?

Report on state actions: Dave Z to gather information.

b(19) Reservoir Storage

This provision will be discussed during the next meeting on April 3.

Report- Implementation actions follow-need to add detail.

c(1) San Joaquin Comprehensive Plan

Have milestones been identified?

Why are there activities underway?

Is this a report?

Are there outcomes beyond report?

Act specifies actions that require Congressional approval

Purpose = information.

Program is currently in limbo, as a result of Congressional directive to stop.

Does SJ Riparian Restoration Program fit here or in b(1)?

c(2) Stanislaus River

Project cancelled.

Purpose type = information.

3406 (g) Ecological/Water Operations Modeling

Is VAMP timeframe 2009 or 2011?

Purpose = Data and Information.

VAMP model types is related to types 2 and 4.

VAMP Purpose = data to support fisheries (understanding fish benefits).

Activity Type = Report? Program?

Was it effective?

Is there a process to determine its value?

Capture how reports/investigations can be used.

What is the closest mechanism?

CVPIA Program Review Summary

Flows Provisions

Postponed until next week's meeting April 3.

Add matrix line for b(1)(b).

Action Items Review

- The Department of Water Resources and Northern California Water Association participation has been invited and to date have not come to Working Group meetings or responded to meeting notifications.
- One suggestion to engage stakeholders is to invite specific individuals or agencies to a Working Group meeting when a topic believed to be of interest will be discussed.
- Serge will bring names and contact information of other agencies and groups who may be interested in participating or at least viewing information on Reclamation website.
- Information will be circulated to Trinity-based groups so they can consider if they interested in actively participating in the Working Group.
- Talking Points are still incomplete. Reclamation will follow up with Al Zepp and Bob Stackhouse to identify status.
- First draft of CVPIA Glossary of Terms will be completed this week.
- Shana and Susan working on Tribal consultation.

Parking Lot

- The group reviewed discussion points still open and needed further information and clarification.

Discussion Topics for April Meetings

- Complete flows discussion of the Act.
- Completion Binning Exercise.
- Methodology for reviewing performance goals as a group.

CVPIA Program Review Summary

Participants

Michael Aceituno — NMFS
Ara Azhderian — SLDMWA
John Beam — CDFG
Serge Birk — CVPWA
Gary Bobker — Bay Institute
Frances Brewster — SCVWD
Paul Forsberg — CDFG
Zeke Grader — PCFEA
Ann Hayden — ED
Tim Hayden — Yurok Tribe
Heather Hostler — Hoopa Valley Tribe
Campbell Ingram — Nature Conservancy
Danny Jordan — Hoopa Valley Tribe
Don Marciochi — Grassland WD
Clifford Lyle Marshall — Hoopa Valley
Tribe
Jacolyn Martins — Hoopa Valley Tribe
Barry Nelson — NRDC
Paul Olmstead — SMUD
Jeff Phipps — NCPA
Dennis Puzz — Yurok Tribe
Jeff Quimby — CCWD
Spreck Rosekrans — ED
Bob Stackhouse — CVPWA
Tom Stokeley — Trinity Co.
Bernice Sullivan — FWA
Jerry Toenyes — NCPA
David Widell — Ducks Unlimited
Alan Zepp — NCPA
Dave Zezulak — CDFG

Agency Team

John Engbring — FWS
Dale Garrison — FWS
Roger Guinee — FWS
Susan Hoffman — Reclamation
Shana Kaplan — Reclamation
Allan Oto — Reclamation
Susan Ramos — Reclamation
Charles Gardiner — Consultant
Janice Kelley — Consultant

CVPIA Program Review