

CVPIA Program Review

Stakeholder Meeting

Monday, March 6, 2006

Participation of Others

All the following individuals and groups have been contacted regarding participation in the Working Group

Hoopa Valley Tribe – no response to date

Yurok Tribe – interested, not available on Monday

BIA – interested, will likely participate only in the Roundtable

Zeke Grader, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, interested, will participate

Barry Nelson, NRDC – interested, but not available on March 6 but will participate

National Marine Fisheries Service – no response to date

Alternative Ways to Engage Participants

The group reviewed the alternate ways to participate and the level of commitment necessary for each forum.

Agreement: The Working Group discussed the role for and reporting to the Restoration Fund Roundtable:

- Restoration Roundtable is an established, balanced stakeholder-run interest forum, of middle level management.
- Existing Working Group for CVPIA evolved from the Roundtable.
- Working Group will report progress and results to the Restoration Roundtable
- Working Group's role is to provide information for the detailed program activity review being conducted by the Agencies.
- The Agencies are responsible for the public outreach for individual program activities.

Beginning Thursday March 9, the Working Group will begin using a conference call dial-in to allow access for those individuals and groups at a distance. The group agreed that the conference call should provide access, but not be considered a substitute for participation at the meeting.

Action Items: Set up conference call dial in for March 9, 2006

PART Review

For the benefit of the first time participants attending the Working Group, Susan Hoffman explained circumstances surrounding the decision to move forward with the CVPIA Program Activity Review (PAR) and the Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART). She added that the Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) set a deadline of April 14 for the first draft of the PART, which created the need for an aggressive writing and review schedule. At the same time, the PAR deadline is set for July consistent with Washington Office expectations. The Parallel Process term arose from these two processes occurring at the same time.

CVPIA Program Review

Review of Definitions

Agreement: The group collectively agreed to add “outputs” to the end of the definition of Actions, so the line will now read, “Planning, implementation, and/or monitoring tasks that are deemed necessary to accomplish an established outcome or output.”

CVPIA Program Activity Review (PAR)

Agreement: After some discussion, it was decided that “All program activities eligible for funding from the Restoration” accurately describes the scope of the CVPIA Program Activity Review.

Action: Shana will provide an updated contact list for the Restoration Roundtable, including 17 tribes and other organizations that were not listed.

Commitment to Engagement

Agreement: The Working Group agreed that the following participation is needed and expected for the Working Group.

- Attend a full day meeting each week (may listen in by phone)
- Volunteer for takeaway assignments and complete them on time
- Participate in subgroup committee meetings for specific, immediate tasks

Ground Rules

Agreement: After a brief discussion of ground rules set during the initial Working Group meetings in February, the Working Group discussed and agreed to abide by all of them. Being candid and honest was identified as critical to a successful process. The Working Group collectively agreed to bring issues of concern into the group first for a collective resolution instead of speaking externally as an individual voice.

Draft Purpose Statement

First-time stakeholders reviewed the Purpose Statement and agreed that it made sense to the degree that they understood the review process.

Agreement: The group agreed that the July target is to complete a program review, recognizing that there will likely be more work after July. The target goal for July is to:

- Show substantial progress in completing the PAR and identify next steps.
- Explain why if the review cannot be completed and how it can be completed
- Stay focused and continue making progress keeping the review process as transparent as possible.

Action: Jeff, Bernice and Susan will integrate additional comments from today’s discussion into the purpose statement. Other participants were directed to speak directly to any of the drafters of the purpose statement to provide individual comments before the meeting on Thursday, March 9.

CVPIA Program Review

Terminology & Definitions

First time stakeholders requested clarification on terms used to describe Performance Goals and Performance Measures. Susan provided the explanation and said that all terms and definitions are in alignment with those used in the PART process.

Matrix

Stakeholders agreed that the Matrix is a critical tool for organizing the information. The Matrix remains incomplete on the Act level. There was discussion how to fill in the remaining information on the Matrix in the most effective way. Program Managers are reviewing the document to fill in information relative their respective programs (on the Program level).

Action: A small group of stakeholders will meet to review the Matrix by the Thursday March 9 meeting to:

- Highlight issues where provisions need to be consistently expressed in relationship to the Act;
- Fill in targets and timeframes;
- Weigh options for organizing the Matrix, so similar groupings of programs can be pulled out for further study. (Sorting by activity type is one likely choice);
- Insert relevant text from the Act for the narrative description in the Activity Description Box. A website link to the full text provisions of the Act will be inserted when relevant.

The group discussed two strategies for completing the Matrix. First, starting with a simple Program/issue that is easy to understand and working toward the complex, or second, start with a successful program and then move into a controversial topic.

Agreement: There was also discussion whether “complete” programs need to remain in the Matrix for review. The group decided to leave in completed programs because there may be value in reviewing them for comparison purposes to incomplete programs although they will be low priority for filling in the program-level information. In the July report, there will be an explanation of why specific programs are considered complete.

Presentation to the Restoration Roundtable

Action: The presentation will include the CVPIA fact sheet, annual work plans, website citations, and budget documents. The Agencies will prepare a slideshow presentation to the Restoration Roundtable. Dave Widdell, Jeff Phipps, Campbell Ingram, Bob Stackhouse and Ann Hayden agreed to participate on a panel to answer questions. The decision to determine whether the Matrix will be useful at the March Roundtable was deferred until the Thursday, March 9th meeting. An agenda will be circulated in advance to Roundtable members.

Questions to help prepare for the Roundtable meeting or answer at the meeting:

- What questions is likely to be raised at Restoration Roundtable?
- What information is needed from the Restoration Roundtable?
- Is the Working Group missing anything?

CVPIA Program Review

- Is the Working Group moving in the right direction?

Roundtable Meeting Notification

Action: A news release for the media will follow from Reclamation Public Affairs to announce the meeting. Notifications to announce the Restoration Roundtable will be sent to the mailing list on Tuesday, March 7

Working Group Meeting Discussion

Agreement: Work Group meetings will be held weekly beginning the week of March 13. Monday is the first choice. Tuesdays will be the alternate meeting day.

CVPIA Fact Sheet

Action: Stakeholders are to review the fact sheet by Thursday, March 9 so a final is finished by Thursday, March 16.

Media Response and Protocol

Stakeholders discussed the most effective strategies for responding to media inquiries. They discussed the need to be proactive with the media. The CVPIA process has now been written about in several newspaper stories, including *Sacramento Bee*, *The New York Times*, and *Fresno Bee*.

Action: Reclamation Public Affairs is the first place where media inquiries should be directed. Al Zepp and Bob Stackhouse will summarize facts and information from the Working Group meetings that can be referred to when contacted by reporters for interviews. These points will be regularly updated and circulated.

Working Group Meeting Schedule

Thursday, March 9 1-4 pm
Monday, March 13 10 am – 4 pm
Monday, March 20 10 am – 4 pm
Tuesday, March 28 10 am -4 pm

Meeting Review

+
More stakeholders are present
Meeting moved forward
Sound review of material
Good snacks
Agency preparation was well done

-
Need more representation from other groups
Need to do a lot of work

CVPIA Program Review

Participants

Ara Azhderian	SLDMWA
John Beam	CDFG
Serge Birk	CVPWA
Frances Brewster	SCVWD
Ann Hayden	ED
Campbell Ingram	The Nature Conservancy
Don Marciochi	Grassland WD
Paul Olmstead	SMUD
Jeff Phipps	NCPA
Bernice Sullivan	FWA
Jeff Quimby	CCWD
Bob Stackhouse	CVPWA
Jerry Toenyes	NCPA
David Widell	Ducks Unlimited
Davie Zezulak	CDFG
Alan Zepp	NCPA

Agencies

John Engbring	FWS
Charles Gardiner	Facilitator
Dale Garrison	FWS
Roger Guinee	FWS
Susan Hoffman	Reclamation
Shana Kaplan	Reclamation
Janice Kelley	Support
Roger Pollock	Consultant
Susan Ramos	Reclamation