

CVPIA Program Review

Working Group Meeting

Monday, April 3, 2006

Purpose Statement Review

Minor changes are as follows: The document will include: implementation status and achievements to date, perspectives and conclusions, and recommendations.

Ground Rules Review

Reiterated and discussed ground rule regarding external discussion topics related to internal process. Reinforce open forum to bring issues to Working Group. The Working Group restated their understanding that open and candid discussions are critical and reaching consensus (not necessarily full agreement) continues to be a key element in moving forward with an objective evaluation.

PAR Process

First Draft report will be available for public to review in mid-June at the earliest.

Shana and Dale are working with each program manager to refine performance goals. Program managers may attend Working Group meetings if necessary to address specific program questions.

The report issued for decision makers will include the perspectives and issues on all sides of performance goals and associated recommendations.

Action: Shana asked Working Group participants supply copies of information in advance of meetings whenever any member has information they believe relevant to the CVPIA PAR process and worth sharing with the group.

- This action is intended to keep the Working Group on task with the agenda and
- Provide the opportunity for Reclamation to review and distribute pertinent information seen as important to the PAR.

Matrix Review

Deferred to future meeting

- b(1) other and b(19) need further review and refinement in the matrix
- All inactive programs

Flows

b(1)(B)

- Annual work plan specifies timeframe for completing the IFIM studies.
- Are these significant enough to specify progress and milestones at the program level?
- What is the next step after studies?
- Linkage to b(12)
- What is metric for modifying operations and doing flow evaluations?

CVPIA Program Review

- If there are two programs, they need to be separated and create implementations for each.
- How to show outcome of studies in Matrix?
- What is the metric for modified operations?
- Output target should be specified. We need a specific number.
- “Flows provided by b(2)” is not accurate or complete - insert into supporting provision
- This is an ongoing program that could generate new studies in the future
- Clarify “do not conflict with...”
- Since amounts vary show actual amounts in the past few years in the report.
- b(1)(B) is not exclusively responsible for achieving b(1) goals, move to supporting provision - note contribution
- b(1)(B) purpose “Protect all life stages” is slightly different than the doubling goal. May need different or additional outcomes.

b(2)

- ROD has different text description for b(2) than stated in the Matrix. ROD language needs to cite b(2) text.
- Reference contribution to doubling
- Reference AFRP in supporting provision
- Be sure to note purpose / benefit for Bay-Delta
- Can we develop refined metrics beyond doubling?
- Assess whether dedication of water was adequate to meet AFRP flows.
- Note link to EWA.
- Include Water Quality Control Plan.
- Note linkage to state and Federal ESA.
- Expand outcome description quote to include species protection
- Add “in perpetuity” to Act timeline
- Note language “upon enactment”
- Act allows for reduction if there is no need or if there is no water to be managed.
- It is dedicated every year for multiple purposes.
- How do we deal with banking – list of supporting provisions – 3408 (d), b(1), b(3)
- Outcomes:
 - Show 1- contribution to AFRP
 - 2- other outcomes
 - 3- not the only way to accomplish outcomes
- Be careful to maintain purpose of showing where these aren’t outcomes daily articulated.
- What is the duration of a specific metric, as related to others?
- Does a blank mean that no outcome is required or refined outcomes needed?
- Note that other provisions contribute to AFRP outcome.

b(3)

- Does the water supply plan look at the supply options specified in the Act?
- Does the program use these methods?
- Outcomes - apply same logic of contribution to doubling, but not exclusively.
- Reference b(1)(B) in supporting provisions to bring in “supporting all life stages.”

CVPIA Program Review

- Be sure to evaluate full range of tools in assessment
- Why is ROD language cited in Output target? It's confusing to put it in this column.
- Specify which ROD.
- Output timeframe description is more appropriate in outcome.
- Program has not addressed any long-term water acquisition policy.
- 200,000 in ROD is not based on needs—may need to look at goal based on actual needs.
- Show linkage to multiple outcomes for b(2).
- Recognize annual and in perpetuity to supplement b(2) for multiple purposes.
- Show linkage to CALFED ROD baseline and to VAMP.

b(7) Flow Standards

- Outcome metric should be meeting the standards stated in the Act
- Output – target isn't only acre-feet
- Supporting provisions – cite at Act level - COA and authorizing legislation 99-546
- Timeframe should reflect that many standards need to be met more frequently than annually.
- Does Napa agreement change COA so much that we need to address the issue.

b(8) Pulse Flows

- Modify Act target language to move text to program level
- Program has developed some qualitative description of what and how to use water
- SJRA specifies targets for San Joaquin River
- Water used is from b(2) and b(7).
- Cross reference to b(1)(B), b(2), and b(3).
- Outcome is increased survival of migrating fish.

b(9) Flow Fluctuations

- Metric should be developed of a program to eliminate fish stranding.
- If water is b(1), b(2), the metric is acre-feet
- Metric is ramping rate or the number of fluctuations
- Act references DWR /DFG Oroville. Show reference.
- Show linkage to b(19)

Completion Binning Exercise

Based on their current understanding of the programs participants were asked to place each program in to a category of Complete, Not Complete, and Needs More Discussion. If a program is placed in the Complete or Not Complete category someone who disagrees may move it to the Need More Discussion category.

Complete

- b(6) Shasta
- b(17) ACID
- 3406 (e) Supporting Investigations
- 3406 (f) Project Fisheries Impact Report

CVPIA Program Review

Needs Further Discussion

- b1 AFRP
- b1 Other Habitat Restoration
- b1 Other San Joaquin River
- b2 Dedicated Yield
- b3 Water Acquisition
- b5 Contra Costa
- b7 Flow Standards
- b9 Flow Fluctuation
- b10 Red Bluff
- b11 Coleman
- b12 Clear Creek
- b13 Spawning Gravel
- b14 Delta Cross Channel
- b15 Old River Barrier
- b16 Camp
- b18 Striped Bass Fishery
- b19 Reservoir Storage
- b20 GCID
- b21 AFSP
- b22 ag-waterfowl
- b23 Trinity
- c1 San Joaquin Camp Plan
- c2 Stanislaus River Basin Needs
- d1 Level 2 Refuge Water
- d6 Private Wetlands
- 3406g Ecology Water System Ops model
- 3408i Water Conservation
- 3408j Water Augmentation

Not Complete

- b4 Tracy
- d2 Level 4
- d5 San Joaquin
- d5 Refuge Construction

Upon Completion of the exercise Shana handed out Table 1 from the CVPIA 10-Year Accomplishment Report. This table summarizes activities and accomplishments from 1993-2002.

Grouping for Performance Measure Evaluation

The group reviewed groupings for discussion and refinement of performance goals that is shown on slide 13 of the Powerpoint presentation. Categories to start with include Annual and Ongoing

CVPIA Program Review

Programs and Long-Term/Time Certain programs. Each are further divided into Output and Outcome.

Action:

The following changes will be made to the grouping table in slide 13 that describe the review groupings for Performance Measures.

Progress Measures

- d1 and d2 change to white on annual side
- b22 becomes time certain
- b9 not a report, goes into Annual Outcome

Data and Information Category

Create a new category for data and information activities. Include the following:

- b16
- b19 Carryover Storage
- g Eco/Water Ops Models
- All program activities from the Reports category except for b9

Refining Performance Goals

- Brainstorm major programs
- Program Managers develop measures for review for annual program activities
- Show where goals need to be developed
- Working Group focus on Long-Term/Time Certain groupings
- Two prongs
 - Annual - need effectiveness metrics
 - Long term/time certain – need progress measures

Discussion: Working Group identified a desire to work on Long-term/Time Certain programs as the first step to develop performance goals. Program Managers can start with the Act provisions listed in the annual category.

Highest Priorities for Discussion

- b(1)
- b(3)
- b(4)
- b(23)
- b(1) other
- b(5)
- d(2)
- b(21)

CVPIA Program Review

CVPIA Section 3407

- Catch 22 - Act says consider completion of all provisions vs. continuing effort/ funding expected. Situations can be created so provisions are interpreted in such a way that nothing could be defined as accomplished.
- Trinity River eligibility
- Is Trinity entitled to a share of funding based on its contribution to the Restoration Fund?
- Does reduction affect Trinity River funding?
- Is continued funding necessary to accomplish objectives?
- Can you shift actions to create other/better ways to meet objectives?
- How do we define reasonable efforts for b(1) related to effectiveness?
- Who decides completion?
- Recognize that Restoration Fund wasn't sole source of funding for accomplishing goals.
- Consider the funding obligation for each provision when considering completion. (e.g. Refuge.
- Consider new and alternative tools to replace Restoration Fund funded actions.
- Seems to recognize that higher funding was for one time things and lower funding when those things are done.
- How do we consider programs that have expanded beyond CVPIA direction?
- How do you deal with programs that never started, such as Striped Bass?
- Consider actions moving from implementation to operations.
- Do state and tribes have a different role in preparing the report?

Trinity River Restoration

The Working Group discussed the need to identify an objective review process for Trinity River Restoration.

- An objective assessment of issues related to CVPIA b(23) and issues outside the scope of the CVPIA.
- Reclamation offered to meet the after the meeting with the Tribes to scope out CPAR issues versus issues outside the scope of this review.
- Further discussion within the Working Group was deferred to the Parking Lot.

Action Items Reviewed

- Development of talking points still pending from Bob Stackhouse and Al Zepp.
- No participants identified the need for additional participation.
- Glossary of Terms first draft distributed to Working Group.

Parking Lot

Trinity Restoration Funding

Schedule of April meetings

April 13 cancelled due to Reclamation's PART deadline on April 14

Next meetings are Monday, April 17 10 am – 4 pm
 Tuesday, April 25 10 am – 4pm

CVPIA Program Activity Review

Participants

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

Agency Team

Allan Oto — Reclamation
~~John Engbring — FWS~~
Charles Gardiner — Facilitator
Dale Garrison — FWS
Roger Guinee — FWS
Susan Hoffman — Reclamation
Nick Hindman — FWS
Shana Kaplan — Reclamation
~~Roger Pollock — Consultant~~
~~Susan Ramos — Reclamation~~