

**California Bay-Delta  
Public Advisory Committee  
Meeting**

**June 26, 2002**

**1:00 – 5:30**

**Jean Harvie Community Center  
14273 River Road  
Walnut Grove**

**June 27, 2002**

**9:00 – 3:00**

**The Point Restaurant  
120 Marina Drive  
Rio Vista**



1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155  
Sacramento, California 95814

(916) 657-2666  
FAX (916) 654-9780  
<http://calfed.ca.gov>

## Memorandum

Date: June 19, 2002  
To: California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
From: Patrick Wright, Director  
Subject: June 26 - 27, 2002 Meeting in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta

The next meeting of the California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee is scheduled for Wednesday afternoon, June 26 and Thursday, June 27, 2002. On Wednesday, a site visit and tour of the Delta is scheduled from 1:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.; the rendezvous point is the Jean Harvie Community Center in Walnut Grove. On Thursday, the meeting is scheduled from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at The Point Waterfront Restaurant in Rio Vista, hosted by Mayor Marci Coglianesi. For both days, the meeting setting will be informal; the Delta is beautiful and has a relaxed lifestyle. In addition, The Point is located on the Sacramento River. The agenda and related meeting materials are enclosed. Included is a map and directions to the meeting sites.

The purpose of the meeting is to update the Committee on Delta issues, projects and activities, and recommend strategies for long-term financing of CALFED Bay-Delta Program actions and projects. The Committee will also act on the recommendation from the Water Supply Subcommittee on the In-Delta Storage Program.

On Wednesday, the afternoon tour is co-sponsored by the Delta Protection Commission and Department of Water Resources and will highlight activities that help shape the Delta economy and contribute to meeting the CALFED goals and objectives. Committee members from the Delta (Christopher Cabaldon, Marci Coglianesi, and Tom Zuckerman) and others will brief the Committee on CALFED programs/projects and Delta land use issues, such as Delta agriculture, including wildlife friendly practices (Staten Island), conveyance (Delta Cross Channel) and Storage (In-Delta Storage/Mitigation sites) facilities, levees, habitat restoration (levee protection/riparian habitat restoration along Georgiana Slough), water quality issues, recreation, the future site of the Science consortium (Rio Vista), and cultural history. This will be a great introduction and update on the Delta (for background see the enclosed "Delta Subsidence in California" and visit the Commission website at <http://www.delta.ca.gov>). I hope many of you can make the tour.

---

### CALFED Agencies

#### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Water Resources  
Department of Fish and Game  
The Reclamation Board  
Delta Protection Commission  
Department of Conservation  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services  
Department of Food and Agriculture

#### Federal

Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

June 19, 2002

Page Two

The bulk of the meeting on Thursday is devoted to discussion on short and long-term budgeting and finance issues and Committee action on the Water Supply Subcommittee recommendation on the In-Delta Storage Program. With respect to the first issue, the Committee will receive updates on the status of the state and federal budget processes and prospects for long-term funding of activities included in the Record of Decision. Committee Member Jerry Meral will provide a status update and describe the content of the Water Bond. Chair Gary Hunt will lead discussion on long-term financing strategies.

The Water Supply Subcommittee is meeting on June 19 to develop a recommendation on the In-Delta Storage Program and will forward its recommendation at the June 26 meeting. As background, this packet includes a draft summary report on the Program. In addition, the Lead Scientist's report includes an update on the science review of the In-Delta Storage Program.

Also scheduled for the meeting is appointment of a new Working Landscapes Subcommittee and short briefings from Lead Scientist Sam Luoma and me on progress the Program has made since your March meeting. We may also hear from state, federal, and local elected officials who have been invited to the meeting. During lunch, Members Cabaldon, Coglianesi, and Zuckerman will recap highlights of Delta issues and topics covered during the tour.

For any questions or comments, please contact Eugenia Laychak, Committee Coordinator and Facilitator at (916) 654-4214 or at [laychak@water.ca.gov](mailto:laychak@water.ca.gov). I am looking forward to an informative and productive meeting.

**Packet materials include:**

- Meeting Agenda
- Chair's Report Materials
- Director's Report
- Lead Scientist's Report
- Budget and Finance Materials
- In-Delta Storage Program Draft Summary Report (bound separately)
- Subcommittee Reports
- Meeting Location Map and Directions
- Correspondence
- Delta Subsidence in California (bound separately)

## California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee Meeting

**June 26, 2002**

**Jean Harvie Community Center, 14273 River Road, Walnut Grove**

**1:00 pm – 5:30 pm**

Delta Site Visits and Tour

**June 27, 2002**

**The Point Restaurant, 120 Marina Drive, Rio Vista**

### Agenda<sup>1</sup>

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 9:00 am | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome and Introductions (<i>Gary Hunt, Chair</i>)</li> <li>2. Chair's Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appoint Working Landscapes Subcommittee</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. CALFED Bay-Delta Program Director's Report (<i>Patrick Wright</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Announcements</li> <li>• CALFED Governance Legislation</li> <li>• Water Operations (<i>Kirk Rodgers, Regional Director, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation &amp; Steve Macaulay, Chief Deputy Director, Department of Water Resources</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. CALFED Bay-Delta Program Lead Scientist's Report (<i>Sam Luoma</i>)</li> <li>5. Finance and Budget Issues (<i>Gary Hunt; Action: Recommend Strategies on Long-Term Financing of Program Actions and Projects</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Budgets (<i>Patrick Wright and Kate Hansel, CALFED Bay-Delta Program Staff</i>)</li> <li>• Water Bond Briefing (<i>Jerry Meral, Committee Member</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. Public Comment</li> <li>7. Lunch and Director's Report (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delta Overview (<i>Christopher Cabaldon, Marci Coglianese, Tom Zuckerman, Committee Members and Cindy Darling, CALFED Bay-Delta Program Staff</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>8. Chair's Report (continued)</li> <li>9. Water Supply Subcommittee Recommendation (<i>Steve Hall and Jerry Meral, Co-Chairs and Mark Cowin, Department of Water Resources; Action: Adopt</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-Delta Storage</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |
| 3:00 pm | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Public Comment</li> <li>11. Adjourn</li> </ol>  |

➤ **If you need reasonable accommodation due to a disability, please contact Pauline Nevins at the CALFED Bay-Delta Program at (916) 657-2666 or TDD (800) 735-2929.**

<sup>1</sup> Order of agenda items subject to change.

---

#### CALFED Agencies

##### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Water Resources  
Department of Fish and Game  
The Reclamation Board  
Delta Protection Commission  
Department of Conservation  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services  
Department of Food and Agriculture

##### Federal

Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

## Memorandum

Date: June 19, 2002

To: California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee

From: Gary Hunt, Chair

Subject: Agenda Item 2: Chair's Report – (*Information and Action: Appoint Working Landscapes Subcommittee*)

### Summary

For your information, local elected officials have been invited to address the Committee and the Committee will be asked to appoint a Working Landscapes Subcommittee. In addition, the Committee meeting schedule for the remainder of 2002 will be provided at the meeting. Finally, the March 12, 2002, Committee meeting summary is attached.

### Background

With respect to Working Landscapes, a group of stakeholders have been meeting to promote conservation partnerships between CALFED agencies, private landowners, local governments and conservation groups. The purpose is to work with the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Department of Conservation and other CALFED agencies and provide advice and recommendations on an approach that provides stakeholders with incentives and support, assists them with regulatory processes and minimizes adverse impacts on agricultural resources. It is expected the Subcommittee will be providing consensus advice to the agencies.

### Action

Appoint the Working Landscapes Subcommittee.

### Attachments:

- Draft Working Landscapes Subcommittee Description
- March 12, 2002 Committee Meeting Summary

---

#### CALFED Agencies

##### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Water Resources  
Department of Fish and Game  
The Reclamation Board  
Delta Protection Commission  
Department of Conservation  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services  
Department of Food and Agriculture

##### Federal

Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

**DRAFT**  
**Working Landscapes Subcommittee**  
**California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee**

**Introduction**

The CALFED Record of Decision (ROD) encompasses numerous projects throughout the CALFED Solution Area that are intended to conserve native fish, plants and wildlife and to restore the ecological health of the Bay-Delta system. Private landowners and local agencies and organizations are, by and large, interested and willing to participate in such efforts. However, many landowners and local communities are concerned that they may be prevented from continuing to farm, ranch, or provide flood control on or near lands preserved or enhanced for habitat conservation purposes. To address these concerns, among others, the Secretary for Resources and the Secretary for Food and Agriculture are facilitating and staffing a stakeholder working group that was convened to promote conservation partnerships between CALFED agencies, private landowners, local governments and conservation groups. CALFED believes that an approach that provides stakeholders with incentives and support, and assists them with regulatory processes and permits and minimizes adverse impacts to agricultural resources has the potential to result in a much greater level of success in restoring ecological health to the Bay-Delta region.

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Working Landscapes Subcommittee is to provide advice and recommendations to the California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee on:

1. Implementing aspects of the CALFED ROD as they relate to working landscapes,
2. The working landscapes approach through voluntary local initiatives, financial incentives, and technical and educational opportunities to landowners who manage their land as working landscapes,
3. Institutional barriers that prevent a balanced approach to ecosystem restoration,
4. Minimizing impacts to agricultural resources.

**Vision Statement**

What does a working landscape look like? A working landscape is a place where landowners, agricultural and environmental organizations and government work in partnership to produce multiple benefits for society and the ecosystem. When private landowners are given incentives, technical assistance, educational opportunities and assistance with regulatory requirements, there is the potential to result in a greater level and extent of success in restoring ecological health to the Bay-Delta region and more fully engage local landowners and communities in the CALFED process.

# DRAFT

## **Goals and Objectives**

### **Goals**

Coordinate a stakeholder process to implement a local partnership process and support for the working landscapes effort.

### **Objectives**

Provide advice and recommendations on an implementation plan that includes:

- a) Support for locally based collaborative initiatives
- b) Minimizing or mitigating adverse impacts on agricultural resources and local communities
- c) Coordinate funding and outreach to rural communities

### **Potential Performance Measures**

- Numbers of landowners involved
- Acres involved in working landscapes
- Numbers/types of local projects developed
- Establishment of agricultural implementation plans
- Development of permit assistance streamlining program
- Number of people trained for permit assistance/coordination
- Number of people assisted, number of acres projects assisted
- Number of local voluntary programs developed under SB 231
- Establishment of an agricultural conservation bank/mitigation fund
- Development of good neighbor policies
- Funding provided for conflict reduction
- Development of conservation tools and mitigation measures web site, number of hits
- Establishment of process for coordination w/ USDA Farm Bill programs
- Number of landowner workshops offered, number of participants and participant evaluation
- Number of publications developed and distributed

### **Staff Resources**

The California Department of Food and Agriculture and the Department of Conservation will staff the Working Landscapes Subcommittee.

**California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee**  
**Draft Meeting Outcomes**  
**March 12, 2002**  
**Sacramento Convention Center**

**Members in attendance:** Gary Bobker, Ryan Broddrick, Christopher Cabaldon, Tom Clark, Marci Coglianesse, Martha Davis, George Fraser, David Guy, Martha Guzmán, Steve Hall, Gary Hunt, Leslie Lohse, Jerry Meral, Barry Nelson, Dan Nelson, Bill Pauli, Timothy Quinn, Michael Schaver, Francis Spivy-Weber, Maureen Stapleton, O.L. “Van” Tenney, Marguerite Young, Tom Zuckerman

**Welcome and Introductions (*Chair, Gary Hunt*)**

Bennett Raley, Assistant Secretary for Water Science, Department of Interior and Mary Nichols, Secretary for Resources offered opening remarks expressing support for the Committee and expectations that the different interests at the table should continue to believe the CALFED Program is the forum for resolving California’s water future.

**Director’s Report (*Patrick Wright, CALFED Bay-Delta Program*)**

Patrick Wright updated the Committee on grant programs, the new CALFED electronic newsletter and other CALFED Bay-Delta Program activities.

**Subcommittee Reports (*Subcommittee Co-Chairs*)**

Chairs from seven subcommittees reported on progress made towards delineating priorities, measures for success and schedules for forwarding subcommittee actions to the full Committee. Many of the priorities focused on identifying adequate resources to conduct the work of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program elements and other necessary activities.

**Action Items:**

- Committee appointed the Delta Levees and Habitat Subcommittee and designated Marcie Coglianesse and Tom Zuckerman as co-chairs.
- Committee adopted the subcommittee priorities and measures for success.
- Chair Gary Hunt directed Eugenia Laychak, Committee facilitator and coordinator, to consolidate the 2002 priorities and circulate to the Committee.
- The following Subcommittees are preparing recommendations for Committee action in 2002:
  - ✓ Delta Levees and Habitat Subcommittee - Expects to forward a recommendation on a short-term Levee Program funding strategy for June Committee meeting.
  - ✓ Drinking Water Subcommittee – Expects to present a strategic framework, conceptual model, initial “gaps analysis” and evaluation of ROD actions to Committee in September.
  - ✓ Environmental Justice Subcommittee – Expects to forward a recommendation on the annual Environmental Justice Work Plan at September meeting.

- ✓ Water Supply Subcommittee – Expects to forward recommendation on Delta Implementation Plan at June meeting. May forward recommendation on Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework at June meeting.
- ✓ Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee\* – Expects to forward recommendations on 1) agricultural milestone assurances of high agricultural water use efficiency and 2) a credible certification process for urban Best Management Practices at September meeting.

\* Subcommittee also reported on actions expected for 2003 and 2004.

The Ecosystem Restoration and Watershed Subcommittees are refining their priorities and may forward recommendations to the Committee.

### **Program Budget, Resources and Tracking (*Patrick Wright*)**

Patrick Wright and CALFED Program staff, Kate Hansel and Roseanne McHenry briefed the Committee on the status of the year 2 and 3 budgets and the Program's tracking activities. The March quarterly tracking report was handed out. Members had concerns that the current budget situation may thwart the ability for the Program to make a finding of balance at the end of 2002. Members stressed the importance of ensuring adequate resources for science and tracking activities, environmental justice, the Drinking Water and Levees programs. With respect to tracking, Tim Quinn, Steve Hall and others wanted assurance that tracking activities would be overseen at a high level for appropriate quality control. Responding to concerns expressed by Leslie Lohse, co-chair Environmental Justice Subcommittee, and the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, members urged the Program and agencies to hire a coordinator and make resources available for related actions.

Other guidance and comments:

- Some members wanted more detail on distribution of funds between staff, project implementation and other cost centers.
- Some pointed out that use of consultants increases flexibility, especially with fluctuating budgets.
- Members cautioned that implementers should not be in charge of tracking progress.
- It was suggested that the Program identify critical path projects necessary for moving the Program forward.
- Communication of progress and project performance is important.

### **Action Item**

- Committee asked for a report back from the Program on agency response to Committee comments and guidance.

### **Chair's Report (*Gary Hunt*)**

Chair Gary Hunt led the Committee in discussion on the draft priorities and Committee related actions.

### **Federal Authorization Legislation**

Bennett Raley updated Committee. Committee members heeded legal advice regarding lobbying Congress and Mr. Raley's advice to send a coordinated message to Congress. They also suggested it

was important to quickly send a positive message regarding support for CALFED authorization to national groups that lobby on this issue.

### **Water Operations**

Kirk Rodgers, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, provided an update. Gary Bobker and Dan Nelson provided an overview of pending litigation over Endangered Species Act requirements and ongoing litigation involving the Delta-Mendota and San Luis Water Authority, respectively.

### **California Water Bond**

Patrick Wright provided an overview of the voter and legislative initiatives.

### **Governance**

Committee had in-depth discussion with Senator Jim Costa on SB 1658, legislation to set up a permanent governing structure for the Program. The bill calls for creating a Bay-Delta Commission, with Federal participation, and assigns responsibilities for Program elements to specific agencies.

Issues raised included:

- options for legislating coordination with Federal agencies,
- keeping agencies and Commission accountable and
- membership criteria for Commission.

With regards to coordination, the Senator mentioned other intergovernmental models that may help determine the appropriate relationship between the state and federal governments. Most members seemed supportive of the State assuming the lead responsibility. The Commission will be held accountable through appointment of and regular reporting by the Executive Director. The membership discussion focused on the size and expertise of members. Some members preferred a small Commission, some preferred agency membership only, some suggested that members have specific technical and policy expertise, while others suggested stakeholder members be selected from different regions. Some suggested that stakeholders be represented on the proposed advisory committee to take pressure off increasing the size of the Commission to accommodate all interests.

### **Action Items**

- Steering Committee – Chair formed committee; he and Vice Chair Denny Bungarz will be the co-chairs. Members will be subcommittee chairs and other members designated by Chair.
- Federal Authorization - Committee members will work together to coordinate their messages to Congress.
- California Water Bond - Committee asked for briefing on Water Bond at a future meeting.
- Water Operations - Chair asked Mary Nichols to create a forum to discuss and resolve significant issues in an attempt to avoid the use of litigation as a problem solving approach.



## Memorandum

Date: June 19, 2002  
To: California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
From: Patrick Wright, Director  
Subject: Agenda Item 3: Director's Report – (*Information Item*)

### Summary

Provided below is a brief overview of CALFED Bay-Delta Program and Agency activities since the March 12, 2002, Committee meeting.

### Background

Program Tracking - The June 2002 Quarterly Report will be handed out at the meeting. The report shows progress to March 31, 2002, in terms of expenditures and progress on implementing Program activities and projects for the following five programs: Ecosystem Restoration, Watershed Management, Storage, Conveyance, and Drinking Water Quality.

CALFED Bay-Delta Program Governance – SB 1653 (Costa) has passed its first two Senate committees. The California Bay Delta Act would establish the California Bay-Delta Commission and prescribe its membership, organization, powers and purposes. It would require the Commission and implementing agencies to carry out the programs, projects and activities necessary to implement the Bay-Delta Program.

Ecosystem Restoration Project Awards – The CALFED Management Group has recommended awards totaling \$63.2 million for 59 projects, as a result of the Ecosystem Restoration Program's 2002 Proposal Solicitation Package. Secretary of Resources Mary Nichols will act on the Management Group recommendation. See attachment 1 for a list of projects recommended for funding.

Proposition 13 Grants/Loans – The CALFED Management Group has recommended funding for the following:

---

#### CALFED Agencies

##### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Water Resources  
Department of Fish and Game  
The Reclamation Board  
Delta Protection Commission  
Department of Conservation  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services  
Department of Food and Agriculture

##### Federal

Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

- Groundwater Storage Program Feasibility Studies - 3 projects, totaling \$499,800.00
- Groundwater Recharge Project Construction Loans - 3 projects, totaling \$10 million
- Groundwater Storage Program Construction Grants - 12 projects, totaling \$91,234,556.00
- Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay Grants - 8 projects, \$718,000.00
- Agricultural Water Conservation Feasibility Studies - 21 projects, \$8,874,000.00

Selection of the projects is based on criteria in the application package released by the Department of Water Resources in October 2001. Department of Water Resources Director Tom Hannigan will act on the Management Group recommendation. More detailed information on the funded projects will be available at the June 27 meeting. Also, refer to the following website: <http://www.dpla.water.ca.gov/grants-loans/>.

Water Operations - Kirk Rodgers, Regional Director, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, and Steve Macaulay, Chief Deputy Director, Department of Water Resources, will provide a short update at the Committee meeting.

Delta Highlights - Attachment 2 is a short report. More information and an historical perspective will be provided during the tour and meeting.

**Action**

Information Item - No Action Requested

**Attachments:**

Ecosystem Restoration Projects

Delta Regional Highlights

2002 Ecosystem Restoration Program PSP  
Final Selection Panel Recommendations

Projects Recommended for Funding

Adopt-A-Watershed

*Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Development, Next Phase*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$1,518,395.00

American River Conservancy

*Pine Hill Ecological Reserve*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$800,000.00

American River Conservancy

*Upper Cosumnes River Watershed Conservation Project*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$2,000,000.00

California Department of Fish and Game

*Lower Yuba River Juvenile Chinook Salmon Life History And Thermal Bioenergetics Evaluation*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$733,115.00

Conditions: The Selection Panel recommends funding those tasks associated with the coded-wire tag and rotary screw trap work (tasks 1, 2, 3, 7A, and 9, and potentially portions of task 4).

California Department of Fish and Game

*Suisun Marsh Land Acquisition and Tidal Marsh Restoration*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$1,046,400.00

Conditions: Fund tasks 1-6 only at this time.

California Department of Fish and Game

*Transport, Cycling, and Fate of Mercury and Methyl Mercury in the San Francisco Delta and Tributaries--An Integrated Mass Balance Assessment Approach*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$3,881,215.46

California Department of Water Resources

*Lower Butte Creek Project: Sutter Bypass - Willow Slough Weir Fish Passage Project - Preliminary Engineering Investigation*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$155,000.00

California Department of Water Resources

*Restoration of Eastern Delta Floodplain Habitats on Grizzly Slough in the Cosumnes River Watershed*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$300,000.00

Conditions: Reflecting concerns that the proposed costs for year one efforts are high, the panel requests that the applicants reconsider their budget and propose a workplan that can be carried out for \$300,000. The panel expects that proposed surveys, data collection activities, as well as modeling exercises can be completed at this level of funding.

Carl Mesick Consultants

*Continued Studies for the Knights Ferry Gravel Replenishment Project, Phase 2*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$139,744.00

Conditions: The Selection Panel recommends funding for one year (not three) of work as proposed.

Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group

*Kids for Our Creeks*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$164,579.00

Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

*Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$5,748,112.00

Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

*Staten Island Wildlife-Friendly Farming Demonstration*

Fund (with conditions)

Recommended Funding: \$1,507,459.00

Conditions: The Selection Panel recommends that project implementation is consistent with the terms and conditions of the previous contracts that funded acquisition of Staten Island by The Nature Conservancy.

Environmental Science Associates  
*DISTRIBUTION AND ECOLOGY OF LEPIDIUM LATIFOLIUM IN BAYDELTA WETLANDS*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$223,050.00

Conditions: Task 1 should be funded.

Estuary Action Challenge Earth Island Institute  
*Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Program*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$120,000.00

FARMS Leadership, Inc.  
*Cultivating Watershed Stewardship*

Recommended Funding: \$1,497,500.00

H.A.R.T., Inc.  
*Sustainable Restoration Technologies for Bay/Delta Tidal Marsh and Riparian Habitat*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$1,800,000.00

Hydrologic Research Center  
*INFORM - Integrated Forecast and Reservoir Management Demonstration for Northern California Water Resources*

Fund (with conditions)

Recommended Funding: \$600,000.00

Conditions: The research review panel and the selection panel felt this proposal should be funded, but that funding should be contingent upon NOAA funding the projected cost share component of this 5-year project.

Marin Audubon Society  
*Bahia Acquisition and Tidal Wetland Restoration*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$3,345,000.00

Meridian Farms Water Company  
*Meridian Farms Water Company - Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$750,000.00

Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.  
*A Feasibility Investigation of Reintroduction of Anadromous Salmonids Above Crocker-Huffman Dam on the Merced River*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$160,758.00

Point Reyes Bird Observatory

*Songbird population responses to riparian management and restoration at multiple scales: comparative analysis, predictive modeling, and the evaluation of monitoring programs.*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$356,876.00

Portland State University

*LIFE HISTORY OF EGERIA DENSA IN THE DELTA: FACTORS CONTROLLING PRODUCTION & FRAGMENT VIABILITY*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$327,937.00

Sacramento Valley Open Space Conservancy

*East Sacramento County Blue Oak Legacy Acquisition Area-Deer Creek Hills Project*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$1,000,000.00

San Francisco State University, Romberg Tiburon Center

*Determining the mechanisms relating freshwater flow and abundance of estuarine biota (the "Fish-X2" relationships): Phase I*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$509,222.00

San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District

*Restoration and Monitoring of Riparian Habitat Corridors Along The Lower Mokelumne River*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$859,405.00

Solano County Farmlands and Open Space Foundation

*Restoring Ecosystem Integrity in the Northwest Delta: PHASE II*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$246,370.00

Conditions: None

Stanford University

*Shallow open water habitats: Hydrodynamics and benthic grazing*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$471,661.00

Suisun Resource Conservation District

*Update Individual Ownership Adaptive Management Habitat Plans*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$214,943.33

Sutter Mutual Water Company

*Sutter Mutual Water Company-Tisdale Positive Barrier Fish Screen and Pumping Plant*  
Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$1,270,000.00

The Nature Conservancy

*McCormack-Williamson Tract Restoration: Wildlife-Friendly Levee Management*  
Fund (with conditions)

Recommended Funding: \$2,476,835.00

Conditions: The Selection Panel recommends that project implementation is consistent with the terms and conditions of the previous contracts that funded acquisition of the McCormack-Williamson Tract by The Nature Conservancy

The Nature Conservancy

*Mill and Deer Creeks Protection and Stewardship*  
Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$4,700,000.00

The Nature Conservancy

*Sub-Reach Planning for the Sacramento River: River Mile 144-164*  
Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$1,488,009.00

Tri-Dam Project

*Stanislaus - Lower San Joaquin River Water Temperature Modeling and Analysis*  
Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$661,902.00

Prop. 204

Tri-Dam Project

*Test and Demonstrate a Portable Alaskan Weir to Count and Characterize Runs of Anadromous Salmonids in the Stanislaus River*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$659,590.00

Tuolumne River Preservation Trust

*Tuolumne River - Big Bend Project*  
Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$706,649.00

Conditions: Fund acquisition-related components of the proposal.

Turlock Irrigation District  
*Tuolumne River Sediment Acquisition and Spawning Gravel Transfusion Project*  
 Fund (as is)  
 Recommended Funding: \$4,350,000.00

University of Arkansas  
*HYDROCLIMATIC RECONSTRUCTION AND ANCIENT BLUE OAK MAPPING OVER  
 THE DRAINAGE BASIN OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY*  
 Fund (as is)  
 Recommended Funding: \$747,741.00

University of California, Davis  
*Delta Smelt Culture and Research Program*  
 Fund (in part)  
 Recommended Funding: \$400,000.00  
 Conditions: The Panel recommends partial funding (2 years) of the currently proposed project to continue culture development and expects that the expanded production (30,000 per year) and the nutritional studies should be completed at the \$200,000 per year level.

University of California, Davis  
*Demonstration Project to Test a New Interdisciplinary Approach to Rehabilitating  
 Salmon Spawning Habitat in the Central Valley*  
 Fund (as is)  
 Recommended Funding: \$254,720.19

University of California, Davis  
*Distribution, and abundance of shrimp, plankton and benthos in Suisun Marsh: Tidal  
 marsh as a refuge for native species*  
 Fund (as is)  
 Recommended Funding: \$271,804.00

University of California, Davis  
*Primary Production in the Delta: Monitoring Design, Data Analysis and Forecasting*  
 Fund (as is)  
 Recommended Funding: \$359,201.00

University of California, Davis  
*Restoration of Sacramento Perch to San Francisco Estuary*  
 Fund (as is)  
 Recommended Funding: \$572,732.00

University of California, Davis

*Selenium Effects on Health and Reproduction of White Sturgeon, Acipenser transmontanus, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$199,732.00

University of California, Davis

*Sex-reversal in Central Valley Chinook salmon: occurrence and population genetic Consequences*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$211,936.00

University of California, Davis, Agronomy Department

*The ecological and economic costs and benefits of alternative agricultural practices: Sediment, nutrient, and pesticides in runoff from conservation tillage and cover cropped systems*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$1,892,916.00

Conditions: Cut expenses ten percent from amount budgeted by increasing economy of effort rather than eliminating tasks

University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

*Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$179,783.00

University of California, San Diego, Scripps Institute of Oceanography

*Effects of Climate Variability and Change on the Vegetation and Hydrology of the Bay-Delta Watershed*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$645,656.00

US Fish and Wildlife Service

*Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$289,784.00

US Geological Survey

*EVALUATION OF MERCURY TRANSFORMATIONS AND TROPHIC TRANSFER IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY/DELTA: IDENTIFYING CRITICAL PROCESSES FOR THE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$2,262,567.00

US Geological Survey

*Investigating in situ Low Intensity Chemical Dosing to decrease Delta waters DOC concentrations and DBP Precursors while accelerating wetland peat accretion rates and reducing flood risks*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$767,134.50

Conditions: Provide half the project funds.

US Geological Survey

*Pyrethroid Insecticides: Analysis, Occurrence, and Fate in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and Delta*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$800,000.00

Conditions: Fund only: (1) the study's methods development component and (2) the analysis of limited numbers of environmental samples (water, colloids, sediment, and aquatic biota) from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and in the Delta, as needed and sufficient to test the analytical methodology.

USDoC National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, Southwest Fisheries Science Center

*Comprehensive Assessment of Genetic Population Structure and Diversity for Central Valley Chinook Salmon*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$385,869.00

Water Education Foundation

*Tiered Public Outreach Program*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$360,000.00

WaterTech Partners

*Full-Scale Demonstration of Agricultural Drainage-Water Recycling Process Using Membrane Technology*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$316,090.00

Conditions: Fund Tasks 1.1 through 1.4 only

William Lettis & Associates, Inc.

*Geomorphic and Geologic Mapping for Restoration Planning, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$120,000.00

## Yolo County Parks

*AT-RISK PLANT SPECIES, HABITAT RESTORATION AND RECOVERY, AND NON-NATIVE INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT*

Fund (in part)

Recommended Funding: \$400,000.00

Conditions: Fund up to \$400,000, with a revised budget justification, subject to approval by CALFED, for work to be completed for this amount.

## Yuba County Water Agency

*Narrows 2 Powerplant Flow Bypass System*

Fund (as is)

Recommended Funding: \$4,280,600.00

## Yuba County Water Agency

*Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project*

Fund (with conditions)

Recommended Funding: \$68,260.00

Conditions: Fund 50% of project costs, so long as the applicant is not implementing this project pursuant to a State Water Resources Control Board order or decision.

Projects Recommended for Consideration as Directed Action

## American Land Conservancy

*Aquatic and Wetland Habitat Restoration for the Sun River Property*

Amount Requested: \$242,404.00

## California Department of Fish and Game

*Central Valley Steelhead Population Structure Evaluation*

Amount Requested: \$65,002.00

## California Department of Food and Agriculture

*Expanded Prevention, Detection, and Control of Purple Loosestrife in the CALFED Bay-Delta Watershed*

Amount Requested: \$457,162.00

## California State Coastal Conservancy

*Big Break and Marsh Creek Water Quality and Habitat Restoration Program*

Amount Requested: \$2,998,049.00

## California State Coastal Conservancy

*Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project*

Amount Requested: \$32,500,000.00

California State Coastal Conservancy  
*Napa-Sonoma Marsh Restoration Project*  
 Amount Requested: \$4,511,400.00

California State Reclamation Board  
*TWO-DIMENSIONAL DETAILED HYDRAULIC MODEL FOR DETERMINING  
 FLOOD CONVEYANCE IMPACTS OF ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS IN  
 THE YOLO BYPASS*  
 Amount Requested: \$635,382.00

Deer Creek Watershed Conservancy  
*Lower Deer Creek Restoration and Flood Management: Feasibility Study and  
 Conceptual Design*  
 Amount Requested: \$1,860,000.00

Ducks Unlimited, Inc.  
*White Mallard Dam and Associated Diversions - Phase III Construction*  
 Amount Requested: \$7,047,987.00

M & T Chico Ranch  
*M&T/Llano Seco Fish Screen Facility - Short-Term/Long-Term Protection Project*  
 Amount Requested: \$1,816,500.00

Natomas Mutual Water Company  
*American Basin Fish Screen and Habitat Improvement Project*  
 Amount Requested: \$10,175,000.00

Reclamation District 108  
*Reclamation District No. 108 Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen*  
 Amount Requested: \$7,200,000.00

S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.  
*Assessment of Life-History Characteristics and Genetic Composition of Oncorhynchus  
 mykiss Throughout California*  
 Amount Requested: \$698,730.00

San Francisco Estuary Institute  
*Mercury and Methylmercury Processes in North San Francisco Bay Tidal Wetland  
 Ecosystems*  
 Amount Requested: \$1,108,380.00

San Francisco Estuary Institute  
*MERCURY IN CENTRAL VALLEY SPORT FISH: DEFINING THE MERCURY  
 PROBLEM*  
 Amount Requested: \$2,116,121.00

San Francisco Estuary Institute  
*MERCURY IN DELTA FISH: ESTABLISHING A NETWORK FOR LONG TERM STUDY*  
 Amount Requested: \$1,456,531.00

Solano County Farmlands and Open Space Foundation  
*Restoring Ecosystem Integrity in the Northwest Delta: PHASE II*  
 Amount Requested: \$1,556,853.00 (also being 'Funded in Part' for \$246,370)

Sonoma Ecology Center  
*Arundo Eradication and Coordination*  
 Amount Requested: \$2,066,432.00

Stillwater Sciences  
*Merced River Corridor Restoration Plan Phase IV: Dredger Tailings Reach*  
 Amount Requested: \$8,547,285.00

Stillwater Sciences  
*Physical modeling experiments to guide river restoration projects*  
 Amount Requested: \$2,472,750.00

The Nature Conservancy  
*Battle Creek Protection and Stewardship*  
 Amount Requested: \$2,200,000.00

The Nature Conservancy  
*Implementing a Collaborative Approach to Quantifying Ecosystem Flow Regime Needs for the Sacramento River*  
 Amount Requested: \$1,927,032.00

The Nature Conservancy  
*Restoration of the Confluence Area of the Sacramento River, Big Chico and Mud Creeks*  
 Amount Requested: \$2,882,945.00

The Nature Conservancy  
*Sacramento River Restoration: Chico Landing Sub-Reach (RM 178-206)*  
 Amount Requested: \$4,950,032.00

The Water Forum  
*Lake Natoma Temperature Curtains Pilot Project*  
 Amount Requested: \$1,960,196.00

Tuolumne River Preservation Trust  
*Tuolumne River - Big Bend Project*  
 Amount Requested: \$974,474.00 (also being 'Funded in Part' for \$706,649)

Turlock Irrigation District  
*Tuolumne River Mining Reach Restoration Project: Warner-Deardorff Segment No. 3 - Construction*

Amount Requested: \$10,839,000.00

University of California Sea Grant  
*West Coast Ballast Outreach Project*

Amount Requested: \$526,259.00

University of California, Davis  
*BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF GREEN STURGEON IN THE SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN WATERSHED*

Amount Requested: \$1,219,387.00

University of California, Davis  
*Development and Implementation of Bioaccumulation-Based Mercury Monitoring in Support of Restoration, Remediation, and the Regulatory Process for Cache Creek, Prospect Island and Adjacent Tracts, the Yolo Bypass, and Cosumnes River*

Amount Requested: \$895,571.00

University of California, Davis  
*Improved Fish Screen Design and Operation for Native Sacramento-San Joaquin Watershed Fishes*

Amount Requested: \$2,243,794.00

University of California, Davis  
*Invasion dynamics of perennial pepperweed, *Lepidium latifolium*, and their consequences for protection of natural and restored wetlands in the San Francisco Estuary*

Amount Requested: \$152,272.00

US Bureau of Land Management  
*Cosumnes River Preserve Perennial Pepperweed Control Project*

Requested: \$141,500.00 Amount

US Bureau of Reclamation  
*Battle Creek Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Project*

Amount Requested: \$12,000,000.00

US Fish and Wildlife Service  
*Mercury in birds of the Bay/Delta Watershed - adverse effects to reproduction and patterns of bioaccumulation.*

Amount Requested: \$1,080,855.00

US Fish and Wildlife Service

*Recovery Implementation for Riparian Brush Rabbit and Riparian Woodrat on the Lower Stanislaus River*

Amount Requested: \$13,903,917.00

US Fish and Wildlife Service

*Sacramento River Chinook Salmon Individual-based Model*

Amount Requested: \$350,000.00

US Geological Survey

*Assessing the hazards of mercury and selenium to the reproductive success of birds .*

Amount Requested: \$394,922.00

Yolo Basin Foundation

*Pacific Flyway Center Initial Planning*

Amount Requested: \$394,919.00

\* \* \*

## **DELTA REGIONAL HIGHLIGHTS**

### **CALFED Staff**

Patrick Wright has assigned two long time CALFED staff to coordinate activities in the region. Ron Ott is the Delta Implementation Coordinator and Cindy Darling is the Delta Outreach Coordinator effective June 1, 2002.

### **Delta Implementation Plan**

The Delta Protection Commission CALFED subcommittee has reviewed the most recent draft. The CALFED Delta coordinators will be working with the DPC staff and others in the Delta to complete the planning process.

### **Ecosystem Restoration**

The CALFED Management Group recommended approval of \$9 million for projects in the Delta. Additional projects were recommended as directed actions in the Delta. There will probably not be a grant application cycle this fall.

### **Conveyance**

North Delta: The North Delta project is planning to have public scoping meetings this summer as they move forward with their planning for ecosystem restoration and flood control actions.

Delta Cross Channel: The second year of studies of the Delta Cross Channel are complete. This information is critical to the CALFED program's thru-Delta conveyance concept; the CALFED agencies are seeking guidance on how best to re-operate the Cross Channel gates to protect water quality at the pumps and to protect fish passing through the Delta.

South Delta Improvement Plan: CALFED agencies are currently focusing on increasing State Project pumping capacity to 8,500 cfs as questions about funding availability and staging of decisions on fish screens are considered. Future plans call for increasing pumping to 10,300 cfs. DWR is planning to have a draft environmental document available to the public by the end of the year and permits in hand by June 2003.

### **Storage**

A report on In-Delta Storage has been released and will be more fully considered at the Committee meeting.

### **Levees**

Unfortunately, the Levee Program will likely suffer large cuts due to the overall shortfalls in the State's General Fund. While the State budget has not yet been passed, some of the cuts that have been proposed in the Levee Program would reduce funding to the point where no additional funds would be available either for special projects or as matching funds for the levee subvention program-the levee maintenance program where the costs of annual maintenance are shared with the Reclamation Districts.

## Memorandum

Date: June 19, 2002  
To: California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
From: Sam Luoma  
Lead Scientist  
Subject: Agenda Item 4: Lead Scientist's Report (*Information Item*)

### **Background**

The purpose of this briefing is to bring BDPAC up-to-date on several issues with which the CALFED Science Program has been involved. In its second year, the program has continued to establish the expectation that science has an important role in achieving CALFED goals and that science practices (i.e., peer review, use of experts to advise on technical issues, growing understanding) are standard operating procedures. The accompanying packet lists several activities of the Science Program. In our presentation we will present examples of important accomplishments that illustrate the improving state of science in the Bay-Delta Program.

### ***A. Outcomes from "Water operations and environmental protection in the Delta: Scientific issues."***

On April 22 and 23 the workshop was held with the purpose of familiarizing stakeholders, state and federal policy makers, managers and the interested public with the underlying science issues associated with water operations and environmental protection in the Delta. Attached are the agenda from the meeting and a general research agenda that was developed as a result of the discussion. Major conclusions from the workshop will be discussed.

### ***B. 2002 Review of the Environmental Water Account***

The Environmental Water Account is a signature CALFED effort and a novel approach to assuring water supply reliability while protecting environmental resources. The Science Program is involved in bringing broad science issues to the day-to-day operations of the EWA via the activities of two science advisors. In 2002, the Science Advisors have been broadly involved in working with the Agencies and informing the lead scientist on issues with regard to the EWA. Two workshops and the annual EWA review will be conducted in 2002. The first workshop is being organized by the Management Agencies and will report on management of salmon in 2002 and discuss critical issues involved in EWA activities conducted to protect salmon. Stemming from the 2001 Annual EWA review, three issues will be a focus of break-out group discussion at the workshop: 1) modification of the

---

### CALFED Agencies

#### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Water Resources  
Department of Fish and Game  
The Reclamation Board  
Delta Protection Commission  
Department of Conservation  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services  
Department of Food and Agriculture

#### Federal

Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

Decision Tree used to guide salmon management, 2) how to improve the Juvenile Production Estimate, and 3) indirect mortality in the Delta. A second workshop (in August) will consider the state of knowledge with regard to Delta Smelt and the EWA. On October 21 and 22, the Science Program will re-assemble for a second annual review the panel of 13 distinguished experts who conducted the 2001 review of the EWA concept and the activities of the EWA in 2001. Attachment B summarizes upcoming events and an agenda for this review is being prepared.

The Science Program's evaluation of the State of Science in the Interagency Ecological Program is an example of an evaluation of the technical basis of CALFED programs. This evaluation was based upon the Science Program's involvement in the IEP throughout the year and upon cumulative comments from the group of experts (Science Advisory Group) that has evaluated IEP activities over the last 5 years. This will not be covered in the presentation, but it is presented for background only.

***C. Status of science review: In-Delta Storage***

The CALFED Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Record of Decision (ROD) identified In-Delta storage as one of five potential surface storage projects. As part of this effort, CALFED decided to explore the lease or purchase of the Delta Wetlands Project, a private proposal by the Delta Wetlands Properties Inc., to develop and market a water storage facility in the Delta.

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program have conducted a joint planning study to evaluate whether the Delta Wetlands Project and other In-Delta storage options meet the CALFED water quality and supply reliability and ecosystem restoration objectives. The study produced six technical and financial feasibility evaluations of the Delta Wetlands Project (Draft Summary Report is enclosed).

The Science Program has convened a panel to review three of the six draft reports (on operations, water quality, and environmental evaluations), plus the draft summary report for technical and scientific feasibility and soundness. The review will be completed by approximately mid-July. The Panel's membership includes expertise in limnology, ecology, water quality, hydrodynamics, groundwater and surface water hydrology, and ecosystem habitat. Attachment C presents guidelines for the panel review.

***D. Climate Variability: CALFED Strategy***

The Committee has recently expressed interest in how CALFED is considering the challenges that are presented by climate change and climate variability. It is self-evident that climate has enormous implications for water management in California. Although CALFED cannot engineer climate, or control its variability, all CALFED actions must operate within the constraints imposed by climate. Therefore, better understanding of climate variability, its controlling factors, and its linkages to issues throughout the watershed is critical.

It is difficult to imagine successfully managing water issues in California for the next decades and centuries in the absence of a better understanding of the long-term and short-term patterns and trends in climate. Those patterns and trends have clear implications for hydrology and issues linked to hydrology. Attachment D presents a draft statement of the strategy that CALFED is using to begin to understand the implications of climate change for the long-term program, taken from testimony to an October 2001 Senate Hearing by Patrick Wright, CALFED Director. Attachment D also includes a statement from the State Hydrologist, prepared for State Senate testimony in October 2001, describing the state of knowledge about how the present trajectory in climate change might affect hydrologic factors important to water management.

***E. CALFED Science Board***

In 2001, the process for establishing a Science Board to oversee the state of science in CALFED was begun. The need for such a board and the tiered process for establishing the Board was described at earlier Committee and Policy Group meetings. In discussions of the original concept for the Board, involvement of the National Academy of Sciences in the highest level of Board activities was considered. The CALFED Science Program, the Department of Interior, and the California Resources Agency have begun discussions with the National Research Council (the working arm of the National Academy) about the appropriate form for Academy involvement. At the meeting we will discuss a proposed interaction within the context of the on-going standing boards and review panels. The process has been delayed by slow release of contracts that will allow us to pay the boards.

***F. Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel: Review of the three year study***

Low dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations are frequently observed over a 10-mile reach of the San Joaquin River near Stockton. It is thought that the low DO acts as a barrier to upstream migration of adult San Joaquin fall-run Chinook and violates water quality standards between June and November. The low dissolved oxygen problem has been the subject of a number of efforts by several different agencies. Most recently, the San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen TMDL Steering Committee, a multi-agency group, has been working on the problem with support from the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED). The causes of low concentrations in the river are complex and directly related to deposition and decay of organic matter in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.

The impetus for corrective action came in early 1999, after U.S. EPA approved California's 1998 303(d) list of impaired water bodies and TMDL priority schedule; the state identified the San Joaquin River (as a Delta Waterway) as a high TMDL priority due to impairment from organic matter enrichment and dissolved oxygen. During the 1999 PSP process, CALFED approved a three-year DWR-led study entitled Determination of the Causes of Dissolved Oxygen Depletion in the San Joaquin River. Prior to CALFED funding, San Joaquin River stakeholders contributed approximately \$500,000 towards studies to identify

sources of dissolved oxygen reducing substances. It was hypothesized that the large contributors of these substances were from local sources, such as the Stockton Regional Wastewater Control Facility. On June 11 and 12 the Science Program convened an expert review of the three years of study of the low DO problem, with the goal of evaluating future science needs and the science basis for various proposed solutions to the problem. The full report from the review committee will be available in mid-July. The Science program will report on preliminary findings.

**Requested Action**

Information item; no action is requested.

**Attachments:**

- A. "Water Operations and Environmental Protection in the Delta: Scientific Issues." – Agenda and Science Proposal
- B. Environmental Water Account: Upcoming Events
- C. In-Delta Storage Guidelines
- D. Climate Variability: CALFED Strategy

**Workshop Series**  
**Convened by**  
**The CALFED Bay-Delta Science Program**

**Title: Water Operations and Environmental Protection in the Delta: Scientific Issues.**

**Date for first in series: April 22, 23**

**Location: Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA**

**Audience & Participants: Stakeholders, State and federal policy makers and managers, scientists and the interested public.**

**Goal:**

The goal of this series of workshops is a balanced discussion among policy makers, stakeholders, and scientists, to characterize the scientific issues underlying water operations affecting the San Francisco Estuary and watershed. A primary objective is to explain the current state of scientific understanding and consider how the CALFED programs, CALFED agencies, existing facilities and operations, and policy decisions depend on and use this knowledge. The workshop will illustrate the contributions of science to the existing management system, it will address what we have learned since the existing policy requirements were set, and it will characterize the most important scientific questions or assumptions that must be addressed to benefit future policy. Presentations and discussions are designed to highlight assumptions and bring out, in a balanced manner, areas of scientific agreement and disagreement. From these discussions, recommendations to further develop critical knowledge and to integrate knowledge into existing State and federal programs and projects will be presented.

A number of technically complex issues are associated with balancing water allocations among environmental, urban, and agricultural uses in the estuary and its watershed. This series of workshops is designed to present and discuss a comprehensive set of those issues; at a level of detail policy makers need to make informed decisions and stakeholders need to understand the scientific basis of those decisions. The April 22, 23 workshop is confined to three topics:

1. Outflow requirements (X2 standard).
2. Scientific issues at the Delta Cross Channel and their implications.
3. Regulation of State and federal water operations: How the requirements came to be; scientific issues, state of knowledge, assumptions, range of interpretations and science needs.

The format of this initial workshop is something of an experiment. If it results in a constructive, balanced discussion and contributes to an agenda for the future, then a similar approach will be used in additional workshops, within the year, to address the comprehensive set of scientific issues relevant to the water management in the Delta. Additional issues include:

- fish screens and screening facilities,
- upstream flow enhancement and restoration,
- sources of “indirect mortality” other influencing factors (harvest, contaminants)
- exotic species,
- interconnection between restoration and water quality
- cost-benefit considerations in managing environmental resources,
- water supply reliability and its relation to climate variability
- South delta barrier operations.

Following each workshop for policy makers/managers and stakeholders, the CALFED Science Program will convene working groups composed mainly of scientists to follow-up on the recommendations by developing detailed agendas of science needs. As it develops, this agenda, and the progress made in accomplishing its goals, will be presented to CALFED’s Policy Group and BDPAC, and in other public forums.

#### Discussions

The April 22, 23 workshop will consist of presentations describing the system and the state of the science. For each issue, one speaker will then give a brief comprehensive and balanced perspective on the policy implications of the science as presented. This will be followed by a discussion period. Two invitees from the stakeholder community will propose, help clarify, or ask the speakers to discuss alternative interpretations, critical uncertainties, critical assumptions (for each issue), and what we know/don’t know about important aspects of the issues. Bennett Raley, Mary Nichols and members of the public will then be invited to ask questions. Questions will be limited to clarification of the state of the science, uncertainties, alternative assumptions, and interpretations. The co-

chairs will be responsible for limiting the time for each question and each response, and for keeping the discussion focused on science issues rather than advocacy statements.

## Agenda for April 22 – 23

DAY-1: April 22, 2002

**Coffee, registration 8:30 – 9:00**

**1. Introduction (20 min.)**

- **9:00 – 9:20**
  - Welcome (Sam Luoma, CALFED)
  - Role of science in defining policy approaches in a technically complicated setting - Bennett Raley (DOI), Mary Nichols (Resources Agency)
  - CALFED Science Program Background – Tim Ramirez (Resources Agency)
- **9:20 – 9:40 Framing the workshops.**
  - Overview of the Delta, the role of the CALFED Science Program, and scope for this workshop -- Sam Luoma (CALFED)
  - Challenges in connecting science and policy-- Helen Ingram (UC Irvine—EWA Review Panel)

**2. Existing water operations practices and environmental needs - overview**

- **9:40 – 9:55** Processes that led to existing standards – Patrick Wright, Director CALFED
- **9:55 – 10:10** Resource management and role of the resource agencies – Diana Jacobs (CDFG)/Mike Thabault (USFWS)
- **10:10 – 10:25** Data sources for resource management in the Bay-Delta watershed – (Perry Hergesell, CDFG)
- **10:25 – 10:40** State and federal water project operational practices—flows, salt, accounting, and responses to environmental needs – Curtis Creel (CA DWR)

**Break 10:40 – 10:50**

**3. Using science to develop policy: Outflow regulations and X2 (2 hours)**

- **10:50 – 11:05** Existing X2 regulatory requirements, policy basis and implications for operations and policy – Bruce Herbold (US EPA)

- **11:05 – 11:35** Scientific process, scientific underpinning, new data, range of interpretations, next questions - Wim Kimmerer, SFSU.
- **11:35 – 11:45** Management and policy implications of scientific knowledge and uncertainties – Steve Macaulay
- **11:45- 11:50** Next steps: science workplan for X2 – Sam Luoma
- **11:50 - 12:10** Discussion (5 – 10 min Greg Gartrell stimulate discussion by identifying question related to key assumptions, interpretations, uncertainties, and policy implications).
- **12:10 – 12:30** Questions about science issues, initiated by questions from Bennett Raley and Mary Nichols.

### **Lunch 12:30 – 1:30**

#### **4. Delta Cross Channel**

- **1:30 - 1:50** The Delta Cross Channel: brief description of the facility, including purpose, operation plan and constraints. (Tom Morrinstein-Marx, USBR Pat Brandes, USFWS).
- **1:50 -2:05** Translation of management issues into scientific questions and studies. (Bruce Herbold, EPA).
- **2:10 -3:00** Science at the DCC: Early results and new understanding. (Jon Burau, USGS and Mark Pierce FWS).

### **Break 3:00 - 3:15**

- **3:15 - 3:30** Management implications of scientific knowledge and uncertainties. (Ron Ott, CALFED).
- **3:30-3:35** Next steps and facilitated discussion. (Sam Luoma, CALFED/USGS).
- **3:35 – 4:30 Discussion: 5 – 10 min each:** Chuck Hansen, BJ Miller, and Tina Swanson initiate discussion by identifying two to five questions related to key assumptions, interpretations, uncertainties, or policy implications. Questions about science issues follow, initiated by questions from Bennett Raley and Mary Nichols.

### **No Host Mingling session 4:30 – 6:00**

## **DAY 2: April 23, 2002**

### **Coffee 8:30 – 9:00**

#### **5. Managing Exports**

- Existing system for managing Water Diversions
  - **9:00 – 9:15** Water allocation – Lester Snow, Consultant
  - **9:15 – 9:30** EWA and Water Management – Tim Quinn (Metropolitan Water District)
  - **9:30 – 9:50** Science underlying existing management system; salmon science at F&G – Diana Jacobs, CA F&G
  - **9:50 – 10:10** Trends in fish populations; Delta smelt science; implications for policy – Mike Thabault, USFWS
  - **10:10 – 10:25** EWA review panel's recommendations
  - **10:25 – 10:50** Hierarchy of science challenges in managing water diversion to protect the environment – Wim Kimmerer, SFSU; , Zach Hymanson, CADWR

### **10:50 – 11:00 Break**

- **11:00 - 11:20** Science challenges in understanding threats to Delta smelt – Bill Bennett, UC Davis
- **11:20 – 11: 35** Management and policy implications of scientific knowledge and uncertainties - Jerry Johns (CA DWR)
- **11:35 – 11:45** Elise Holland. Science and EWA, including key questions. Sam Luoma, Next steps
- **11:45 – 12:30** Questions about science issues, led by Bennett Raley and Mary Nichols.

### **12:30 – 1:30 Lunch**

- **1:30 – 1:50** Challenges in science-based salmon management: Lessons from the Northwest – Jim Anderson
- **1:50 - 2:10** General state of science, new findings and needs: Salmon – Steve Lindley or Churchhill Grimes, NMFS Santa Cruz
- **2:10– 2:30** Summary of key uncertainties, assumptions and key needs identified by the conference – Sam Luoma.
- **2:30 –3:00** Wrap-up by DOI and Resources reps

**Final questions from audience.**

## **Environmental Water Account: Upcoming Events**

- 1. *EWA and Salmonid fishes*: Workshop, July 24, 25, 2002. State of California, Economic Development Department Auditorium, 7th and Capitol, Sacramento**
  - a. Agenda**
    - i. EWA and salmon management in 2002**
    - ii. Decision tree for actions**
    - iii. Juvenile Production Estimates**
    - iv. Indirect Mortality in the Delta**
  - b. Contact if you want to attend: Randall Brown, rl\_brown@pacbell.net**
- 2. *EWA and Delta Smelt*: Workshop, August (date, location and agenda in preparation not determined), 2002**
- 3. *Annual Review of the Environmental Water Account***
  - a. October 21, 22**
  - b. Sacramento Convention Center**
  - c. Agenda in preparation**

CALFED Science Proposal:  
Biological Science to Support Water Operations  
4/20/02

**Draft**

**Introduction**

The review of the first year of CALFED's Environmental Water Account once again demonstrated the need for strong scientific support for actions and activities taken by the management agencies to protect fish and other environmental resources. Reviews of 1999-2000 EWA activities occurred in two species-specific workshops (Brown and Kimmerer 2001 a,b), in a report by the management agency and stakeholder biologists (Kjelson et al.2002) and by an EWA review panel convened by CALFED (Cowan et al. 2001). The call for understanding of the consequences of specific actions through better science was a common theme in all reviews.

While the EWA reviews provided the impetus for focusing on a CALFED science agenda, the need is broader than the EWA. The baseline regulatory framework (the EWA's Tier 1) is supported by science but in almost all cases the scientific underpinnings could be improved. CALFED has and will spend hundreds of millions of dollars in restoration projects and engineering to improve water management in the San Francisco Estuary and its watershed. Improving our understanding of the implications of regulatory actions, restoration activities, and engineering changes are three important priorities of the CALFED Science Program. This goal requires that we better understand, and explain, the net effects of the above activities on managing threatened species, restoring populations of fish and wildlife and restoring ecosystem functions. The ultimate goal of this specific agenda is to develop a statement and workplan characterizing the most important biological science needs to support water operations and then to use the agenda to guide implementation to meet those needs. We recognize that meeting all the priorities above will require discussions, studies and research well beyond the biological science needs described in this agenda. The additional needs will be described elsewhere.

The reviews of EWA demonstrated that while more understanding of the Delta is important, science needs also lie outside of the area where a particular action or activity occurred. For example, to evaluate population level impacts of Delta actions taken to reduce estimated losses of juvenile Chinook salmon at the project pumps, one must have: reliable estimates of: 1) the number of parents and the percentage females; 2) their fecundity; 3) survival from egg deposition to arrival at the Delta; 4) survival through the lower bays and ocean; and 4) subsequent numbers of spawners. A particular science need is to determine the fate of Chinook salmon fry that leave their natal rivers in the late winter/early spring period. Do they rear in the Delta and make a significant contribution to subsequent escapement? Because of inherent variability in biological processes, we must acquire this information over several life cycles before reaching general conclusions. A similar situation arises when delta smelt move between the Delta and the Suisun Bay complex and environmental conditions in both areas are likely to affect year-class strength.

Thus the environmental scope of this aspect of the Science Program's science agenda ranges from individual species (including Chinook salmon and steelhead, delta smelt, Sacramento splittail and green sturgeon) to ecosystem functions (food supply and utilization, for example) to such broad based environmental protection measures as the X<sub>2</sub> standard. It ranges from direct study needs in the Delta to needs for understanding of aspects of the life cycle outside the Delta.

Our proposal is organized around general observations about areas where we need to increase our understanding followed by a few specific examples of where we expend of our initial efforts. This draft represents the beginning of a process geared to providing better scientific support for many of the day-to-day decisions management agencies must make to protect environmental resources. This is a consensus effort, so comments to the Science Program are requested from agency and stakeholder biologists, as well as agency and CALFED management as we develop the proposal and to acquire the resources needed to conduct the proposed expansions of monitoring, research and analysis. The goal is to have a well defined agenda by the fall 2002 meeting of the EWA review panel.

### **Some initial thoughts on a Science Agenda**

This initial draft of the agenda lays out some criteria and tools necessary to accomplish the goal of enhancing the biological science basis of water operations.

#### **Criteria**

A science agenda should be developed around certain key criteria so that monitoring and research will:

- Take the long view – that is do not use EWA or other relatively short timelines to constrain the program. As pointed out earlier for Chinook salmon, learning about some aspects of this species will require one or more decades.
- Identify and attempt to eliminate obvious critical bottlenecks in knowledge – for example, it is probably feasible to better understand losses of delta smelt and salmonids to predators in the Delta and in particular at the intakes to federal and state pumping plants in the Delta. For some species biologists and managers debate about the magnitude of the losses and the effects of the EWA and other water management actions. But even if losses from predators are small for the population, there is benefit to better understanding and managing take, as long as that is defined as a critical goal of existing and proposed management actions. In the longer term it is critical to progressively develop an understanding of the implications of the direct losses of at risk fish species at the state and federal intakes.
- Recognize the importance of more than one target species with the short list including longfin smelt, Sacramento splittail, green sturgeon, all Chinook salmon races and steelhead.
- Recognize the importance of ecosystem characteristics and functions.
- Develop over time - that is, the program evolves as we learn more.

- Provide answers to big (and expensive) decisions that CALFED must make in the near future – for example, dual conveyance versus isolated facility.
- Be feasible within the available funds, personnel and time. Another way to state this is “Are we capable of significantly advancing the state of knowledge within a seven year time frame and with reasonable resources (ie several tens of millions of dollars)?”
- Make maximum use of available resources and data. This criterion may require that we rethink the way we do things.
- Provide an iterative feedback loop between scientists and managers to reduce uncertainty in our understanding of key populations and ecosystem processes and our ability to manage them.

## Tools

There are several underutilized tools available to scientists, and in particular to biologists attempting to understand a complex ecosystem. Annotated examples include.

- *Quantitative analysis of existing data sets.* There appear to be several long-term data sets that could provide additional information. An example is the hatchery release data base, in particular releases of coded wire tagged salmon from the Coleman National Fish Hatchery. Before proceeding with such analyses we would have to determine the quality of the data, length of record, etc. Publication is an essential component of this process and any contracts developed through this agenda would include a requirement for peer reviewed publication.
- *Data management systems.* The ability to analyze existing data sets depends in part on the availability of the data along with sufficient metadata to help the analyst determine their usefulness. Some data, such those from the Interagency Ecological Program, are fairly readily available, although even with IEP data, some are not available to a wide audience. The needs for better data management are especially great for salmonid data. A comprehensive, accessible and coherent system of data storage is needed, as well as a system whereby system ecologists can determine what is available.
- *Models.* Models include conceptual as well as mechanistic representations of what we think we know about the ecosystem or some component of the overall system. In the Bay/Delta there appears to be a growing divergence between physical and biological scientists in their approach to modeling. On one hand, mathematical models of estuarine circulation are becoming more sophisticated and more accurate descriptions of reality. With the possible exception of the particle-tracking model, many biologists have not embraced the use of models, either conceptual or mechanistic. Several salmon models have been written over the years but there has been little application of the models to management questions. Model use might increase if key assumptions in biological models were better supported with field or laboratory data.
- *Publication.* If we were to look at the open literature on the San Francisco Estuary and its watershed, the conclusion might be that there has been a lot of scientific research in the estuary, but many critical holes in understanding remain. Physics, geochemistry, contaminants and lower trophic levels are best understood, less is

known about fish and there is little in the open literature about watersheds in general and salmonids in particular. Some relevant results are not in outlets where they can be reviewed and/or widely read. It is important that a new tradition of peer reviewed publication begin now. Peer reviewed publications provide an opportunity to make our information available to colleagues, with the goal of helping ensure that our methods and conclusions are appropriate for the hypotheses being examined. Without this peer review process, our science can lack credibility.

- *Research.* In many cases hypothesis driven research is needed to resolve difficult ecological questions being asked by managers – that is we need to get to beyond describing what happened to explaining how it happened. Conceptual and mechanistic modeling can help determine where to focus the research.
- *Monitoring.* Monitoring plays several roles in the science agenda and it is important that monitoring goals be established early on. In the Bay/Delta system monitoring include at least four basic purposes.
  1. To evaluate system status and trends. That is, are things getting better? (Snapshots of key species and ecosystem functions over time.)
  2. To monitor project performance. That is, did the project do the things the proponents listed in their proposal? (Did the project rebuild the spawning riffle as proposed?)
  3. To evaluate project impact. That is, did the project have the desired outcome? (Did spawning salmon use the new riffle?)
  4. To help determine when and where to take action, such as real time monitoring and monitoring take level at the state and federal intakes. (Using data from fish sampling in the watershed along with fish salvage data to determine the need for an EWA action.)

In concept monitoring is reasonably straightforward, but in reality the programs must be carefully designed, conducted and updated to serve their intended purposes. The data must be periodically checked, electronically archived and made available to interested parties. Most important is an on-going and comprehensive interpretation of the collected data.

- *Organization.* To be most effective, the science agenda must fit into some overall organizational framework to help ensure coordination among the various parts. Down one step from the overarching framework, individual elements must also be organized to maximize the chances of success in providing the information needed by scientists and biologists managing the system, and convince critics that it is being managed well. The new delta smelt workgroup, organized under the IEP, provides an example of what should develop into a solid approach to better understanding this enigmatic beast. In particular, the EWA review pointed out that Central Valley salmonids require a similar coordinated framework. The IEP's Central Valley Salmonid Team provides a useful coordination function for a portion of the salmonid efforts, an broader element is needed to encompass the diverse salmonid elements.
- *Reviews/Workshops/white papers.* One of the more effective means of addressing key science issues involves preparation of a summary of what we know about a subject, convening a working meeting to address the summarized information and suggest additional analyses, conclusions from the data and possible monitoring and research to answer unresolved questions. To achieve results, workshops normally

best structured around a specific topic and a limited number of active participants. Workshops should result in products (summaries and conclusions) that can make their findings available to interested parties. Most important it is critical that participants have an expectation, and a mechanism, for implementing appropriate workshop recommendations.

- *Resources.* Acquisition and efficient resource allocation are a challenge for a major science program. But new science dollars, staff, contractors, or collaborations are necessary if we are to achieve the advances in understanding necessary to meeting the goals of the ROD. The day-to-day workload of management agency staff is often such that there is not much time available for contemplative analyses and publication; much less adding new science goals to their assignments. Re-direction of effort may improve resource allocation to a limited extent, but will only help at the margins. New support is needed if we are to increase the pace of progress. Better communication between scientists and managers with the goal of helping managers understand how well the actions benefit target resources must be part of the investment. We also need to continue to promote active university, private sector, NGO and local involvement in all aspects of the CALFED science agenda.

### **General discussion of science needs**

The following sections briefly outline some general areas where better understanding could immediately improve the basis of management.

**Abundance, Distribution and Trends of Critical Fish Species: Improving existing descriptive approaches.** Existing efforts in the Delta and its watershed include monitoring several fish species in the channels accompanied by a limited number of special studies. Actual population sizes are not well known and population estimates suffer from serious, and largely unquantified, uncertainties. In most cases in the Delta, indices are used to describe relative size. General abundance trends can be discerned, but data are usually not adequate to determine if EWA and other actions are responsible for, or even contribute to, the observed trends. Even in those instances when we have actual abundance estimates, such as Chinook salmon spawning escapement, better estimates of variability (“error” in statistical terms) are needed to help biologists and managers assess their reliability and usefulness.

**Life cycles of Critical Species, and Population Models.** One of the keys to defining population status is to understand all aspects of population biology including recruitment, mortality, and migration. Although fragmentary information is available for some species we need to know more about the vulnerability of all life stages to natural and human induced perturbations. As is discussed earlier, modeling (conceptual and mechanistic) provides a convenient, logical and transparent means of summarizing life history information. Thorough knowledge of life cycles will take time to develop, but we must start now to move beyond the limited state of the present knowledge, especially for key species such as delta smelt. A good example of how to approach this question was the use of the splittail life history model to develop questions about key life history components and probe threats and bottlenecks to recovery. Moving towards establishing even rudimentary models for other species could be equally beneficial. Also modeling can be used to put various aspects of life history in context and to develop research priorities.

**Environmental Influences on Critical Species and Ecosystems.** Relatively little is known about what attributes of the Delta are important for the species critical to water management, how exports and water management affect those attributes and how the attributes will change as the system is modified. We are only now beginning to appreciate, and understand, water movement in the Delta and adjacent bays and how this movement affects fish and ecosystem functions. The fate, transport and influences of trace elements, nutrients and organic compounds (including pesticides) must be better known before we can understand their impact on the biota.. Interdisciplinary studies that include detailed and coordinated measurement of the physical, chemical, and biological components of the ecosystem have begun to address the how different habitats in the Delta and upstream function. A suite of such studies, targeted both at species and ecosystem functions (often now called a Bioregional Assessment) is needed to build our foundation of understanding of why the Delta is important to salmonids, smelt and other target organisms. Better management in the long-term depends upon pursuing such an approach. Examples of questions to be addressed include:

- Do deeper channels and open water bodies mean more predation and recycling of nutrients?
- How do exotic macroflora affect the communities, predation and threatened species?
- How will the physical changes proposed for the Delta (barriers, massive fish screens, changes in water transport) affect water movement

**Threats to critical species and ecosystems** Export pumping has long been considered by many to be the primary anthropogenic threat to fish in the Delta. Management actions in response to Endangered Species Act listings accentuated the emphasis on the influences of direct mortality at the pumps – ie take and export restrictions. Partly as a result of the emphasis on direct and indirect impacts of the pumps, relatively little is known about alternative threats to populations of critical species. A more complete view of vulnerabilities in the life cycle and environmental influences will require direct consideration of sources of stress beyond exports, and understanding how effects of exports fit into any patterns. Decisions about long-term management in the Delta are being made with the implicit assumption that reducing effects of exports will improve conditions for, and numbers of, critical fish species, but this assumption has not been rigorously tested. Failure to test alternative hypotheses costs management agencies credibility in discussions of alternative restoration actions such as an isolated Delta channel and

will continue to be a major problem until we better understand all threats. This is not to say that direct and indirect effects of the pumps are not important – but it is critical that we lay out their impacts in the context of broader assessment program.

### **Physical and Biological Basis of the Specific Measures used to Manage Delta Species.**

Managers have a relatively limited number of tools to achieve resource protection and a similarly small set of measurements to determine when to use the tools and how well they worked. Relationships between available protective measures, including use of environmental water, and populations need to be much better understood to facilitate multiple goal management – for example how much water to use and when and where to use it. Biological triggers, migratory patterns, Joint Production Estimate, yellow/red light numbers, Export/import ratios and are specific examples of measures that have physical, biological or correlative foundations. Unfortunately the depth of knowledge about each of these measures is relatively thin. The scientific foundation of these, and other measures, will become more firm.

**Adaptive Management.** Three elements of adaptive management (AM) can be incorporated immediately in our research/monitoring program.

1. Using new scientific findings into water management actions in the Bay/Delta system. For example, the recent change from Red Bluff Diversion Dam ladder counts to carcass surveys in estimating winter Chinook escapement demonstrates that new information.
2. Using an experiment/assessment approach. When experiments/assessments can be conducted at relatively low risk (for example, recent studies on flow distribution and salmonid movement near Delta Cross Channel/Georgiana Slough) the payoff can be large.
3. Seek opportunities for formal adaptive management experiments. The March 19-20, 2002 AM workshop (sponsored and organized by the ERP Science Board) provided the opportunity for scientists and managers to consider formal experiments in three important areas of uncertainty – instream flow benefits for salmonids; the ecological value of floodplains; and the importance of tidal habitat in the Delta and upper Bays. In each case the participants were able to provide some specific recommendations as to particular study areas (the Yolo Bypass, for example) but there is much work to be done before an actual AM proposal can be developed. Agencies and stakeholders should encourage and support development of these, and other, formal AM proposals.

### **What would we do first?**

The above generalities provide a conceptual framework (albeit somewhat sketchy) for a science agenda. This is an initial framework; the next step to complete the plan for the remaining four years of CALFED phase 1, is to identify the specific projects that will have the highest priority. A draft of those is under development, but the general list and the specific project list also will be affected by the science supported by the Ecosystem Restoration Program; input from managers, stakeholders and other scientists; and as we develop workshops on key issues. An implicit science agenda already exists in the San Francisco estuary and its watershed. The

considerable community of scientists and managers is conducting a wide variety of monitoring and research. Goals of our effort is to make the science agenda more explicit, to help ensure that it addresses the most important areas of uncertainty and to accelerate the pace of learning to keep up with need to accelerate the pace at which we are improving water management and ecosystem restoration. The CALFED ROD, in its wisdom, proposed a budget that would allow accomplishing these goals as well as others.

For CALFED Year 3, the following specific needs have been identified, with an associated budget. The areas of need for biological science to support water operations cut across the five goals of the CALFED Science Program, and are described within those goals.

***CALFED Science Program Year 3 Federal Budget: Narrowing biological uncertainties in water management***

Goal: Advance immediate scientific needs for regulatory and management activities

*Studies: Extend multi-discipline Cross Channel and other junction studies and improve abundance, production, and trend analysis of critical species (\$3.5 million)*

Goal: Improve Ecosystem and Regional Monitoring

*Studies: 1) Better understand the bases of indices and relationship between indices and populations of critical species (\$2 million);  
2) Develop and monitor Performance Measures for ecosystem and critical species recovery and pilot new monitoring technologies (\$2M)*

*continued*

***Year 3 Federal Budget (continued)***

Goal: Better Understand Critical Unknowns

*Studies: 1) Better substantiate technical basis for baseline water: mechanisms underlying X<sub>2</sub> relationships (\$500k);  
2) Define relative importance of Delta habitat, predation, stressors such as temp. and contaminants, mortality at pumps, and ocean condition and harvest [salmonids] to pops. of critical species (\$3M)*

Goal: Adaptive Management - Restoration & Water Management

*Studies: 1) Role of floodplains for populations of critical species - Yolo Bypass experiment (\$1 million)  
2) Comparison of hatchery and wild salmonid survival in regions and across life cycle (\$1.6 million)*

Communication, Coordination & Oversight (\$1.4 million)

**TOTAL: \$15 MILLION**

## **Guidelines for the Science Panel Review of the CALFED In-Delta Storage Program's Reports on the Delta Wetlands Project: Scientific and Technical Review**

The CALFED Bay-Delta Program is a consortium of State and Federal agencies with management and regulatory responsibilities in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary. The Program's mission is to restore ecological health and improve water management for beneficial uses of the Bay-Delta system (for more information on CALFED please see the website <http://calfed.ca.gov>). The CALFED Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Record of Decision (ROD) identified in-Delta storage as one of five potential surface storage projects. As part of this effort, CALFED decided to explore the lease or purchase of the Delta Wetlands Project, a private proposal by the Delta Wetlands Properties Inc., to develop and market a water storage facility in the Delta.

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program have conducted a joint planning study to evaluate whether the Delta Wetlands Project and other in-Delta storage options meet the CALFED water quality and supply reliability and ecosystem restoration objectives. The study produced six technical and financial feasibility evaluations of the Delta Wetlands Project.

The Science Panel's purpose is to review three of the six draft reports (on operations, water quality, and environmental evaluations), plus the draft summary report for technical and scientific feasibility and soundness. The Panel's membership was selected based on the following expertise: limnology, ecology, water quality, hydrodynamics, groundwater and surface water hydrology, and ecosystem habitat. Your role is to help us evaluate the scientific quality and technical soundness of the draft reports, with emphasis in the areas of your expertise. This review is one of a series of reviews. Engineering aspects of the project (a separate report) already have been reviewed internally by DWR and externally by an expert engineering panel several months ago. Also, topics are covered in the draft reports that are beyond the scope of this panel (e.g., economics) that subsequently will be reviewed by experts in these fields.

***Conflict of Interest:*** The CALFED Program attempts to choose reviewers that have no financial connection to the proposals they are reviewing. ***Please do not review this proposal if you have assisted in its development, or if you will receive a financial benefit from the funded project. If you have a connection with the applicants or the submitting institution, you will be allowed to review proposals, but must reveal your connection on the review form.*** A connection to an applicant exists if any of the following relationships were applicable during the past four years: collaboration on research, pilot, or implementation proposal or project; co-authorship; thesis or postdoctoral advisorship; supervisor/employee relationship. An institutional connection exists between employees and their employers. For example, an employee of a state or federal agency will have an institutional connection with a proposal submitted by that agency, even if the applicant is in a different division of the agency than the reviewer. Similarly, a university faculty member will have an institutional connection with a proposal submitted from that university, even if the applicant is in a different department of that university campus.

***Public Nature of Review:*** After the review process is completed, all review comments (without reviewers' names or affiliations) will be made available to the public, including the project applicant.

**Review Questions:** The following questions have been crafted to help guide your review. Please respond to these questions as appropriate but do not allow them limit the scope or content of your review.

### **Questions for the CALFED Science Panel Review**

The key policy question for DWR and CALFED is whether the Delta Wetlands Project and other in-Delta storage options considered in the reports are technically feasible based on the reports' assessments. We do not expect the science review to address this question directly, but your input should help policy makers understand the scientific underpinning available to address this question. It is important to articulate both the strengths and limits of that underpinning. With regard to the studies that were conducted to determine feasibility, please help policy makers understand: Have those studies used approaches at the state of the science? Are the experiments, field studies and analyses credible? Are there alternative approaches that might provide more credible results? Are there scientific issues that are potentially important to evaluating feasibility that remain unaddressed? Have the studies articulated uncertainties and assumptions in a balanced manner? Are there studies in the literature in similar circumstances that could be brought to bear to address the issue of feasibility? In short, would the scientific community view these studies as valid, at the state of the science, and useful to helping managers address the complex questions surrounding operations, water quality and environmental issues of the in-delta storage question? If not, what else can be done in the short-term and the long-term? If you can answer these questions, your assessment will help DWR and CALFED determine the adequacy of the evaluations and plan further studies, monitoring or actions, needed for a reasonable evaluation of risks and benefits from the project.

Please also address these specific issues:

The experiments and much of the analysis contained in the draft evaluations are based on modeling and other analyses that required key assumptions. Are the assumptions clearly articulated and how valid are they? Can you suggest ways to test the key assumptions or approaches that might be better supported scientifically? Are the models appropriate for the questions that need to be addressed? Are there alternative approaches that might be used to compare outcomes?

Do the evaluations consider the pertinent hydrological, biological, and geochemical processes? If not, what important processes need to be assessed and how might they best be addressed?

Are there gaps in knowledge and/or the evaluations that need to be investigated and incorporated into the assessment? For example, would further knowledge of plant life, wildlife, aquatic communities, and hazards or contamination (as proposed by DWR and Reclamation) help the policy analysis?

What further research and studies are needed to fill in gaps in scientific knowledge, test assumptions, and resolve uncertainties that are germane to the assessment of the Delta Wetlands Project?

If this project goes forward, what key processes and indicators should be monitored and tracked to test the assumptions embedded in the feasibility models?

Are there lessons that have been learned from other similar environmental situations that can be applied to this project?

### **Climate Variability and Climate Change: CALFED Strategy.**

The following is a statement of the strategy that CALFED is adopting to include climate variability and climate change among the considerations in water management. The statement is adapted from testimony developed by Patrick Wright and Sam Luoma in October 2001. The document contains a draft statement concisely defining some of what is known about the implications of climate variability and climate change for California water, as written in October 2001 by State Hydrologist Maury Roos.

### **Recent CALFED Program Actions.**

To get a better understanding of the implications of climate change, CALFED has recently undertaken several actions:

1. A small working group of West Coast experts in Climate Change and its hydrologic implications was convened by the Lead Scientist to begin to evaluate implications of climate variability and climate change for water management and proposed CALFED Actions. The group includes scientists from Scripps Institute of Oceanography and the US Geological Survey.
2. The work of that group will lead to publication of a “white paper” that will describe the state of knowledge with regard to implications of climate. From the White Paper, the group will lay out an informed research agenda to help develop knowledge about variability and help us anticipate possible changes. The white paper will be presented as part of a session on Climate Variability in the January 2003 CALFED Science Conference, at the Sacramento Convention Center; presentations to California water managers are also part of the proposal.
3. For the last two years CALFED was one of the sponsors for the Annual PACLIM (Pacific Climate) Workshop in Asilomar, CA. PACLIM has been a leading forum for release of the latest knowledge about climate variability and climate change on the Pacific Coast and the implications of climate.
4. To get an immediate start on defining implications of climate change, a solicitation for proposals was included in the 2001 Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan and the ERP Proposal Solicitation. Advances in understanding about the implications of climate patterns, trends and variability were sought, as these might be achievable in the near term (Dettinger, IEP Newsletter). Other questions for which proposals were sought included:
  - Better understanding of the hydrologic implications of decade scale variability. It is expected that understanding the patterns and origins of that variability might ultimately lead to improved predictability of climate patterns and/or related hydrologic patterns.
  - The existing water management system has buffers to climate variability built in (reservoirs, for example). Climate change has implications for management of

those buffers, some of which might be changed by proposed CALFED actions. So studies that would also help us understand such vulnerabilities were also encouraged.

- Other areas of interest were study of hydrologic conditions during extreme climate conditions in the past, in order to help us think about worst case possibilities.
- Shifts in climate appear to occur as increasing frequencies of certain climate regimes (not as a total change). CALFED also expressed interest in studies that would help us better understand the patterns in such shifts and aid our abilities to predict shifts.

After the white paper is complete it is expected that a fully funded Science Program would release an RFP that would carefully direct funding toward the most important and immediate information needs.

It is expected that a fully funded CALFED Science Program would invest \$1 - \$5 million dollars per year for the next 10 years into better understanding direct implications of climate change for the CALFED program, as we move toward decisions about CALFED actions. The proposals just selected for funding, as having important implications for understanding implications of climate for Ecosystem Restoration were:

University of Arkansas	HYDROCLIMATIC RECONSTRUCTION AND ANCIENT BLUE OAK MAPPING OVER THE DRAINAGE BASIN OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY	<b>\$747,741</b>
University of California, San Diego, Scripps Institute of Oceanography	Effects of Climate Variability and Change on the Vegetation and Hydrology of the Bay-Delta Watershed	<b>\$645,656</b>

**Conclusion.** Clearly, we need more information about the possible effects of climate change on Delta resources and resources throughout California. The CALFED Bay-Delta Program is moving forward to gather that information.

**Statement from the State Hydrologist, Maury Roos, Oct. 10, 2001.**

Long range projections of substantial changes in global climate are being made based on the gradual increases of greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere. The changes which could especially affect California's water resources systems are: changing mountain area runoff patterns, sea level rise, and possibly larger floods. Another related aspect would be changes in vegetation and water consumption which could affect agriculture as well as wildlands.

Should the highlight be "to" or "from"?

The range of forecasted global warming and associated changes is rather large. According to the most recent 2001 Intergovernment Panel on Climate Change summary report, the projected 1990 to 2100 average world surface temperature increase would range from 1.4 to 5.9 degrees C, with an average of around 3 degrees. Of special importance to the Delta is the projected sea level rise of around 0.5 meter (1.6 feet) by 2100 with a range of 0.1 to 0.9 meters.

The amount of rainfall predicted for California varies greatly among the different global models, partly because Northern California is in a zone where impacts of El Nino events are difficult to predict. It could be drier or winters could be a lot wetter, as indicated by the models used for the National Assessment of last year. One impact is sure as global warming occurs. Snow levels in the mountains will be higher and snowpack is likely to decrease with a shift of runoff away from spring snowmelt months into the winter flood season. Less late spring and early summer runoff would tend to decrease Delta outflow then; other factors being equal a generally longer dry season would give more time for ocean salinity to move into the Delta unless checked by higher reservoir releases.\*

Both the international and national reports indicate that there would likely be more intense rain events, hence a greater flood risk. The degree of risk or increase in flood size is unsure, but a 10 percent increase would likely be on the low end of the scale. Higher snow levels in the Sierra during storms would also increase the risk of winter floods. Another factor of importance for Delta flood risk is that channel levees above the Delta are gradually being strengthened, which will tend to convey higher flood flows into the Delta. Historically, in large floods, levee breaks have absorbed some of the flood volume so that the full potential amount has not reached the Delta.

In the longer term, if projections are correct, sea level rise may be the greatest problem for the Delta. The recent historical rate of sea level rise, as measured at the Golden Gate tide gage, has been around 0.2 meter (0.7 feet) per century. We are not sure how stable the Golden Gate tide datum is but rates of apparent rise seem to match estimated worldwide trends. This rate could more than double if the projections verify. Many levees in the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Bay are built on soft peat soil or other weak foundation material. Failures are common during high water events when storms and large inflows elevate Delta high tide levels. In fact, some failures have occurred even in summer months. Rising sea level means channel water levels too will rise by a similar amount, increasing the pressure on Delta levees, with attendant increased risk of failure unless they are strengthened.

The increase in sea level will also increase slightly the depth of Bay and western Delta channels. Channel depth is also a factor in the degree of ocean salinity intrusion, although the increment is not expected to be large.

## Memorandum

Date: June 19, 2002

To: California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee

From: Gary Hunt, Chair

Subject: Agenda Item 5: CALFED Bay-Delta Program Budget and Finance Issues -  
(Action: Recommend strategies on long-term financing of Program actions and projects)

### Summary

At the June 26, 2002, Committee meeting we will address the status of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program current budget and future finances. The expected outcomes of this agenda item are to discuss short-term and long-term Program balance and recommend strategies for long-term financing of Program actions and projects. The attached information demonstrates that without a significant reliable source of funding over the next few years, implementation of the Programmatic EIS/EIR Record of Decision (ROD) will be out of balance and behind schedule in several key areas.

I am recommending the full Committee provide advice on strategies for long-term financing of Program actions and projects.

### Background

At our March 12, 2002, meeting we received a thorough briefing from CALFED Bay-Delta Program staff on the status of the Program's budget and gaps in current and prospective funding. For the June meeting, I have asked Patrick Wright to again brief the Committee on the status of Program budgets and on long-term funding proposals. Committee member Jerry Meral will brief the Committee on the status, contents, and benefits of the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Water Bond).

---

#### CALFED Agencies

##### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Water Resources  
Department of Fish and Game  
The Reclamation Board  
Delta Protection Commission  
Department of Conservation  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services  
Department of Food and Agriculture

##### Federal

Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

CALFED Bay-Delta Program Short-Term Funding and Budgets

Year 2 / Current Year Budget. The total budget for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program in Year 2 is \$885 million (attachments 1 through 3). Funding is less than expected primarily because of the State of California's budget shortfall regarding the General Fund and due to delays in federal funding for the Program.

Attachment 3 shows that in terms of meeting objectives, ecosystem restoration funding is on target (due mainly to State Proposition 204 funding), Water Supply Reliability funding is greater than projected, (due mainly to large user/local funding contributions for water recycling) and Water Quality and Levee System Integrity are underfunded (due to lack of bond funds or federal funds available for these programs).

Year 3 / Next Year. Attachments 4 through 6 show that proposed funding for the next fiscal year (July 2002 to June 2003, state; October 2002 to September 2003, federal) is \$814.5 million, about \$158 million less than projected in the ROD. In terms of Program objectives, Ecosystem Restoration funding will slightly exceed expectations, while Water Supply Reliability, Water Quality, and Levee System Integrity will be funded less than projected in the ROD. Under Water Supply Reliability, the most significantly underfunded activity is water conservation. State funding reflects the Governor's May 2002 revisions to the proposed state budget, which included a General Fund reduction of \$12.9 million.

The Year 3 state budget also includes the Program's response to the March 12 Committee guidance regarding funding gaps. Attachment 7 shows projected funding for activities such as Program Wide Performance and Tracking, Environmental Justice and other issues of concern to the Committee. Funds for these activities will be reallocated from other Program elements beginning July 1.

To sum up short-term funding, attachments 8 and 9 illustrate funding for Program elements and objectives for the first 3 years of the Program.

Long-Term Funding

As you can see from these materials, funding for several key programs is significantly below the projections in the ROD. This is due in part to the state of the California General Fund, the fact that Propositions 204 and 13 limit the types of projects that can be funded by those monies, and federal funding is at a level far less than projected by the ROD.

Water Bond. The Nature Conservancy, Metropolitan Water District and other stakeholders have gathered the necessary signatures to qualify the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 (Water Bond) for the November 2002 ballot.

Attachments 10, 11, 13, and 14 show up to \$2.2 billion for a broad range of water quality, storage, conveyance, levee, ecosystem and watershed restoration, and water conservation and efficiency activities. As you can see, this initiative will provide substantial support over the next few years and will help balance implementation of the different activities. The initiative is an important part of a long-term funding strategy and will meet the state share of obligations in the ROD for several years.

Federal Authorization. In addition, bills to authorize federal agencies to implement Program actions and appropriate related federal funds are proceeding through the Congressional process. Currently, federal participation in the Program is at a level far less than envisioned in the ROD. Federal agencies need Congressional authorization and federal funds to carry out CALFED Program projects and actions. Details on the two legislative bills are in attachment 12. Attachments 15 and 16 demonstrate that current legislation would fill federal funding gaps, and that together with the Water Bond would fund a balanced Program for the next three years.

The last two charts, attachments 17 and 18 illustrate funding for the CALFED Program for the first five years, if the Water Bond were to pass and new federal authorization were enacted.

### **Action**

Committee recommendation on strategies for long-term financing of Program actions and projects.

### **Attachments:**

- Year 2 table and charts (attachments 1 to 3)
- Year 3 table and charts (4 to 7)
- Cumulative CALFED Funding Years 1-3 (8 and 9)
- Summary of the Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002 Summary (10)
- Summary of CALFED Bay-Delta Program Benefits from the Water Bond Initiative (11)
- Summary of Federal Authorization Legislation (12)
- CALFED Funding Years 1-5 (13 to 18)

**CALFED Bay-Delta Program  
Year 2 Funding By Source  
(\$ in millions)  
June 17, 2002**

Program Element	Total Year 2 Funding	State Funding					Federal Funding <sup>1</sup>				User/Local Funding <sup>2</sup>			
		GF <sup>3</sup>	Prop 204	Prop 13	Other State <sup>4</sup>	State Subtotal	USBR W&RR <sup>5</sup>	USACE	Other Fed <sup>1</sup>	Federal Subtotal	SWP	CVPIA RF	Local	User/Local Subtotal
Ecosystem Restoration	\$211.6	\$4.3	\$141.5	\$11.9		\$157.7	\$2.2		\$2.0	\$4.2	\$7.3	\$25.9	\$16.5	\$49.7
Environmental Water Account	\$48.0	\$1.0	\$28.2	\$6.3		\$35.5	\$12.5			\$12.5				
Water Use Efficiency	\$359.2	\$8.2		\$52.4	\$59.8	\$120.4	\$20.5		\$18.2	\$38.7			\$200.1	\$200.1
Water Conservation	\$35.4	\$8.2		\$18.3	\$1.9	\$28.4	\$2.3			\$2.3			\$4.7	\$4.7
Water Recycling	\$323.8			\$34.1	\$57.9	\$92.0	\$18.2		\$18.2	\$36.4			\$195.4	\$195.4
Water Transfers	\$1.0	\$0.8				\$0.8	\$0.2			\$0.2				
Watershed	\$16.4	\$6.4		\$10.0		\$16.4				\$0				
Drinking Water Quality	\$15.7	\$3.6		\$12.1		\$15.7				\$0				
Levees	\$16.9	\$4.7	\$8.4			\$13.1		\$0.2		\$0.2	\$0.6		\$3.0	\$3.6
Storage	\$121.8	\$12.7		\$103.0		\$115.7	\$6.1			\$6.1				
Surface	\$15.2	\$9.1				\$9.1	\$6.1			\$6.1				
Groundwater & Other Activities	\$106.6	\$3.6		\$103.0		\$106.6				\$0.0				
Conveyance	\$60.8	\$3.0		\$31.1		\$34.1	\$4.0			\$4.0	\$17.3	\$5.4		\$22.7
Science	\$18.7	\$3.8			\$2.3	\$6.1	\$3.9		\$2.0	\$5.9	\$6.2	\$0.3	\$0.2	\$6.7
CALFED Science	\$3.5	\$3.2				\$3.2			\$0.3	\$0.3				
IEP	\$15.2	\$0.6			\$2.3	\$2.9	\$3.9		\$1.7	\$5.6	\$6.2	\$0.3	\$0.2	\$6.7
Oversight & Coordination	\$15.0	\$9.1				\$9.1	\$5.6	\$0.3		\$5.9				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$885.1</b>	<b>\$57.6</b>	<b>\$178.1</b>	<b>\$226.8</b>	<b>\$62.1</b>	<b>\$524.6</b>	<b>\$55.0</b>	<b>\$0.5</b>	<b>\$22.2</b>	<b>\$77.7</b>	<b>\$31.4</b>	<b>\$31.6</b>	<b>\$219.8</b>	<b>\$282.8</b>

<sup>1</sup> includes U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Water and Related Resources (USBR W&RR), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers appropriations (USACE), and other federal sources (Other Fed). Other Fed includes U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service funding that contributes to the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP- \$1.2m), National Marine Fisheries Service funding that contributes to the ERP (\$0.81m), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency funding (\$18.2m) that contributes to the Water Recycling Program, and IEP funding from U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (\$0.231), U.S. Geological Survey (\$0.782), National Marine Fisheries Service (\$0.035), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (\$0.04) that contributes to the Science Program.

<sup>2</sup> User subtotal includes State Water Project Funds and CVPIA Restoration Funds that are collected from state water contractors and Central Valley Project water users, but are budgeted and appropriated through the federal and state governments. ERP and WUE amounts include estimates for local cost sharing for grant projects. WUE amount also includes local cost sharing for federal Title XVI recycling projects. Levee amount includes 25% local cost share for levee subventions. Science amount includes local contributions to the IEP. Additional local contributions in other program areas will be estimated as information is available.

<sup>3</sup> A \$27 million budget reduction in General Funds has been adopted for the following programs: WUE - \$3.8 M; Watersheds - \$3.6 M; DWQ - \$5.8 M; Levees - \$8.3 M; Storage \$1.3 M; and Science - \$3.7 M (numbers are approximations).

<sup>4</sup> Includes State Revolving Funds (\$57.9m) from the State Water Resources Control Board that contribute to the Water Recycling Program, DWR funds (\$1.9m) that contribute to the Water Conservation Program, and Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) funding (\$2.3m) from various departments that contributes to the Science Program.

<sup>5</sup> Includes \$28 million for CALFED from P.L. 107-66.

<b>Year 3 CALFED Oversight and Coordination</b> (\$ in thousands) May 3, 2002	
<b>Program Activity/Task</b>	<b>Proposed Reallocation</b>
Executive	\$420
Legal	\$650
Contracts/Fiscal	\$80
Public Affairs/Public Involvement	\$560
Environmental Justice	\$250
Program Wide Performance and Tracking	\$525
Regional Coordinators	\$460
BDPAC Staff & Facility Support	\$215
Finance Plan	\$500
Water Management Strategy	\$500
Ecosystem Restoration/ Environmental Compliance	\$140
<b>Total (all OEE/Contracts)</b>	<b>\$4,300</b>

---

**WATER SECURITY, CLEAN DRINKING WATER,  
COASTAL AND BEACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2002**

---

**1. WATER QUALITY \$955 million**

**(a) Water Security \$50 million**

- Monitoring and warning systems
- Protective Structures
- Emergency interconnections
- Communication Systems

**(b) Safe Drinking Water \$435 million**

- Small system upgrades
- Treatment and contaminant removal
- Drinking water source protection
- Revolving fund

**(c) Clean Water and Water Quality \$370 million**

- Pollution prevention, reclamation, blending and exchange
- River parkways that provide water quality benefits
- Lake Tahoe water quality projects
- Clean Beaches
- Sierra Nevada water quality projects

**(d) Contaminant and Salt Removal Technologies \$100 million**

- Desalination projects
- Treatment projects for MTBE, arsenic, chromium, etc.

**2. CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM: \$825 million**

- Storage planning and studies
- Water conveyance
- Delta levee restoration
- Interim water supply reliability
- Ecosystem restoration
- Watershed protection
- Conservation and efficiency projects

<b>3. REGIONAL PROJECTS:</b>	<b>\$710 million</b>
<b>(a) Integrated Regional Water Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water supply reliability, storm water capture</li> <li>• Wetland restoration, pollution reduction</li> <li>• Groundwater recharge, salt removal and reclamation</li> <li>• Water banking and exchange</li> <li>• Integrated flood management</li> <li>• Fish and wildlife enhancement</li> </ul>	\$640 million
<b>(b) Colorado River</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canal lining</li> <li>• Ecosystem restoration requirements</li> </ul>	\$70 million
<b>4. COASTAL PROTECTION</b>	<b>\$950 million</b>
<b>(a) Watershed Protection</b>	\$200 million
<b>(b) Wetland Restoration and Protection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SF Bay wetland restoration</li> <li>• Southern California wetland and watershed protection</li> </ul>	\$750 million
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$3.44 billion</b>



# Water Bond

- [Legislation](#)
- [Transportation](#)
- [Smart Growth & CEQA Workshops](#)
- [California Environmental News](#)
- [ZEVs & Air Quality](#)
- [Environmental Jobs](#)
- [Natural Resources](#)
- [Electronic Activism](#)
- [Publications & Newsletters](#)
- [About PCL & PCL Foundation](#)
- [Join PCL](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Eco-links](#)

## Water Quality, Supply and Safe Drinking Water Act

### Endorsement List

Metropolitan Water District  
East Bay Municipal Utility District  
League of Women Voters  
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)  
Clean Water Action  
Mono Lake Committee  
The Sierra Fund  
South Yuba River Citizens League  
Bolsa Chica Land Trust  
Trust for Public Land  
Planning and Conservation League  
The Nature Conservancy  
Southern California Water Committee  
Heal the Bay  
League for Coastal Protection  
Hills for Everyone  
Mountains Restoration Trust  
Southern California Agricultural Land Foundation  
Amigos de Bolsa Chica  
California Coastal Coalition  
National Wildlife Federation  
Endangered Habitats League  
Inland Empire West Resource Conservation District  
City of Los Angeles  
Muir Heritage Land Trust  
American River Conservancy  
Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy  
Peninsula Open Space Trust  
Volcan Mountain Preserve Foundation  
Small Wilderness Area Preservation - Los Osos/Morro Bay chapter  
Morro Estuary Greenbelt Alliance  
Friends of Harbors, Beaches and Parks  
Ballona Wetlands Land Trust

**Water Security, Clean Drinking Water,  
Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002  
(2002 Water Bond Initiative)**

**Summary of CALFED Bay-Delta Program Benefits  
1/07/02**

**Summary**

- Provides up to \$2.2 billion for water supply, water quality, ecosystem restoration, and levee stability projects that contribute to the goals of the *Framework for California's Water Future* adopted by the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
- Provides the state share of funding for all CALFED program elements through at least year 5 of the CALFED Program (FY 2004-2005).
- Requires that projects that wholly or partially contribute to the goals of the CALFED Program must be consistent with the CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision, which generally requires balanced implementation, competitive grants, independent scientific review, and a strong emphasis on local control and public involvement. As described below, the vast majority of funds would be allocated through competitive grants to local communities.
- For most projects and programs, requires appropriations to include funds for independent scientific review, monitoring, and assessment.

**Integrated Regional Water Management - \$500 million**

- Provides \$500 million for competitive grants for water management projects that protect communities from drought, protect and improve water quality, and reduce dependence on imported water. [Chp. 8, Sections 79560-4]
- Projects must be consistent with an adopted integrated water management plan designed to improve water supply reliability, water quality, flood management, and ecosystem restoration.
- Examples of projects eligible to receive these funds include the following:
  - Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement
  - Westside Integrated Resources Plan
  - Santa Ana Integrated Watershed Program (SAWPA)
  - San Joaquin River Management Plan
  - Bay Area Blending and Exchange Program
- These funds, together with appropriations from other sections of the bond, would provide significant levels of funding for these and other locally-developed, multiple purpose projects and programs that support the goals of the CALFED Program.

## **Water Supply Reliability - \$485 million**

- Surface water storage: \$50 million. Provides state funds necessary to complete the feasibility investigations for all five surface storage facilities (Shasta, Sites, Los Vaqueros, In-delta, and San Joaquin). With these funds, and continued federal appropriations, each of these projects (except San Joaquin) could be ready to seek authorization and funding for construction by 2005 (San Joaquin by 2006). [Chp. 7, section 79550(a)]
- Conveyance facilities: \$75 million. Provides state share of the costs through 2005 for conveyance actions including South Delta Improvements and Delta Cross Channel improvements. [Chp. 7, section 79550(b)].
- Water Supply Reliability Projects: \$180 million. Provides state share of funding for groundwater management and storage, water transfers, and other water supply reliability projects through 2005, including water acquisitions and groundwater storage agreements related to the Environmental Water Account. [Chp. 7, section 79550(d)].
- Water Use Efficiency: \$180 million. Provides state share of funding for agricultural and urban water conservation grants through 2006. Funds would be used primarily for local projects through a competitive grants program. Also provides funding for developing performance measures and other water use efficiency program activities. [Chp. 7, section 79550(g)]

## **Water Quality - \$374-635 million**

- Safe Drinking Water: \$435 million. Provides grants and loans for infrastructure improvements and related actions to meet safe drinking water standards. [Chp. 4, section 79530] Not less than 60% (\$261 million) shall be available for grants to So. Cal. water agencies to reduce Colorado River water use to 4.4 million acre feet per year.
- Clean Water and Water Quality: \$100 million. Provides competitive grants for water pollution prevention, drinking water source protection, water reclamation, and water quality blending and exchange projects. [Chp. 5, section 79540]
- Contaminant and Salt Removal Technologies: \$100 million. Provides grants for desalination, treatment, and disinfection projects. [Chp. 6, section 79545]
- Provides state share of funding for CALFED water quality program through Stage 1 (2007).

## **Ecosystem Restoration - \$180-420 million**

- Ecosystem Restoration Program Implementation: \$180 million. Provides funds for ecosystem program implementation through 2005, including \$20

million for assisting farmers in protecting wildlife friendly agriculture. [Chp. 7, section 79550(e)]

- Wildlife Conservation Board: \$140 million. Provides grants for acquisition of land and water resources, including conservation easements, from willing sellers. A portion of these funds may be awarded in the Bay-Delta watershed and contribute to the goals of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program. [Chp. 8, section 79565]
- River Parkways: \$100 million. Provides funds for restoration, protection, and development of river parkways. A portion of these funds may be awarded in the Bay-Delta watershed and contribute to the goals of the CALFED ecosystem restoration program. [Chp. 5, section 79541]

### **Watershed Management - \$90 million**

- Watershed Program Implementation: \$90 million. Provides state share of funding for the CALFED watershed program through 2006. Funds will be used primarily for local grants as well as performance monitoring, and local assistance and outreach. [Chp. 7, section 79550(f)]

### **Levee System Integrity - \$70 million**

- Delta Levee Restoration: \$70 million. Provides state share of funding for the CALFED levee program through 2005. Funding would be used for levee improvements and special projects in the Delta. [Chp. 7, section 79550(c)]

## **Federal Authorization Legislation**

H.R. 3208 (Calvert)

Western Water Security Enhancement Act

Authorizes funding through the Secretary of the Interior for implementation of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program to achieve increased water yield and environmental benefits, as well as improved water system reliability, water quality, water use efficiency, watershed management, water transfers, and levee protection. The Federal share of CALFED Program costs and expenses is specified. It also prescribes the process for authorizing appropriations for the Federal share of the costs of implementing Program elements set forth in the ROD in order to maintain balanced implementation in all program areas. Provides for the creation of the Water Security Board and directs the Secretary of the Interior and State of California to develop a proposal to establish this Board to manage CALFED Program operations and to otherwise provide for the long-term implementation of the Program.

S. 1768 (Feinstein)

CALFED Bay-Delta Authorization Act

Approves ROD. Authorizes the Secretary to implement Stage 1 actions (projects and programs planned for the first seven years) subject to environmental review and approval under Federal and State law and which have been certified by the CALFED Policy Group to be consistent with the ROD. Authorizes the expenditure of \$625 million for water supply, \$350 million for water management, \$300 million for ecosystem restoration and watershed management, \$125 million for water quality improvements, \$100 million of levee stability, \$100 million for the science program, and \$30 million for oversight and coordination. Requires the Federal agencies to: 1) coordinate their activities with state agencies, 2) cooperate with local and tribal governments and the public, and 3) implement the Program using the best available scientific information and scientific review. Directs the Secretary and the Federal agency heads to operate under the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Implementation MOU until a permanent governing structure is developed with California counterparts.

**CALFED BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DELTA LEVEES SUBCOMMITTEE**

June 15, 2002

To: CALFED Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee

From: Delta Levees Subcommittee  
Co-Chairs Marci Coglianesse and Tom Zuckerman

Subject: Report from the Subcommittee

**Mission:** The mission of the Delta Levees Subcommittee is to coordinate between CALFED agencies and stakeholders on CALFED Delta Levees Program issues and provide advice to the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee.

**Goals:**

- Coordinate stakeholder support for adequate Delta Levees Program funding to achieve CALFED goals and ROD commitments.
- Coordinate stakeholder support to balance environmental regulatory compliance with achieving Delta Levees Program goals and ROD commitments.

**2002 Priorities:**

1. Make a recommendation to BDPAC on a short-term Delta Levees Program funding source.

**Issue:**

The CALFED Delta Levees Program was severely under-budgeted during Year Two of implementation, and is facing drastic additional cuts in the next fiscal year's State budget. These cuts threaten the stability of Delta levees and the integrity of the State and federal water projects. A brief history and description of the Delta Levees Program is attached.

**Report from the Subcommittee:**

The Delta Levees Subcommittee supports the following to ensure funding of the Delta Levees Program:

1. Support funding the Delta Levees Program at least at the pre-CALFED levels (\$12 million per year of State funds).
2. All funds allocated to the "Special Projects" component of the Delta Levees Program should be restricted to levee improvement projects. The CALFED program should recognize the funds that have been spent through the CALFED program for ecosystem benefits, and acknowledge that those expenditures will result in "net habitat improvement" in the Delta as required in Water Code Section 12311.  
*Note: The Delta Levees Program includes two components: the "Subventions Program" is a matching fund program that helps Reclamation Districts fund on-*

*going levee maintenance; and "Special Projects" is a 100% State-funded program that funds emergency work, special flood control projects identified by the Legislature, and "net habitat improvements" requirements.*

3. Pursue creation of a fund to offset shortfalls in the State budget, such as a fee linked to export of water from State and federal water systems to be earmarked for maintenance and upgrades to Delta levees, recognizing that levees are part of the water conveyance system for the State and federal water projects which are funded by such fees.
4. If new bond funds are approved by the voters in November 2002, or if federal funds become available at the start of the federal fiscal year (October 1), immediately restore the anticipated level of funding for the Delta Levees Program to the levels in the ROD and Implementation Plan.

## Brief History of Delta Levees Program

### **Background:**

The Delta Levees Program was created by the State Legislature in 1973, and has been reauthorized in several subsequent bills. The Legislation was approved after flooding in 1972 allowed an intrusion of salt water into the western Delta. Huge quantities of State and federal project water were released over two months to restore the quality of water at the export pumps to an acceptable level. In addition to protecting Delta water quality, the Delta levees protect State highways, regional water and gas pipelines, regional electric lines, several towns, hundreds of recreation facilities, thousands of acres of agriculture, and aquatic and terrestrial habitat for resident and migratory species.

The Delta Levees Program has been funded from several different sources over time. The program was funded originally from a special fund; when that fund expired, the Legislature then funded the program from bond funds. When those bond funds were expended, the Legislature funded the program from the General Fund. The funds, administered by the Department of Water Resources, are used to match local Reclamation District funding for on-going levee maintenance (the "Subventions Program"), and for "Special Projects". The Special Projects include: "net habitat improvement" requirements in the Delta; levee projects on the eight western islands (Sherman, Twitchell, Jersey, Bethel, Bradford, Webb, and Holland Islands and Hotchkiss Tract); flood control for the Delta communities of Thornton and Walnut Grove; and other projects throughout the Delta.

State funding for the Subventions Program and Special Projects is traditionally split 50-50 between the two programs, but exceptions have been made in the past. The funds are spent throughout the entire 738,000-acre Legal Delta on 1,100 miles of levees.

### **CALFED Delta Levees Program:**

<p>The goal of the CALFED levee program is to provide long-term protection for multiple Delta resources by maintaining and improving the integrity of the extensive Delta levees system.</p>
--

The current Delta Levees Program has been incorporated into CALFED as one of the four original program components, along with ecosystem restoration, water quality improvement, and water supply reliability.

Under CALFED, the Delta Levees Program provides funding for the Subventions Program – levee maintenance, mitigation for impacts from levee maintenance, and emergency response; the source of this money is currently the General Fund. Special Projects provide funding to improve and protect Delta levees and for net habitat improvement. It is implemented through levee reconstruction, subsidence control, and reuse of dredged materials.

The CALFED Delta Levees Program consists of several elements:

- Base Level Protection. Helps Reclamation Districts reconstruct all Delta levees to a base level of protection (the PL 84-99 standard). Currently about 520 out of 1,100 miles of Delta levees do NOT meet this standard. During Stage 1, about 200 additional miles of levee will be brought up to a base level of protection.  
*Under CALFED, no additional levees have been brought to the base level of protection to date.*
- Special Projects. Enhance levee stability on levees that have particular importance in the system. Priorities include life and property, water quality, protection of agricultural production, and protecting ecosystems.  
*Levees on Sherman, Twitchell, and Jersey Islands and Thornton-Hew Hope Tract have been enhanced under this program.*
- Levee Subsidence Control Plan. Develop "best management practices" to control and reverse subsidence and work with reclamation districts and landowners to implement cost-effective measures.  
*No best management practices have been developed.*
- Levee Emergency Response Plan. Enhance the ability of local, state and federal agencies to rapidly respond to levee emergencies. Prepare Plan by 2000.  
*Levee Emergency Response Plan has been prepared, and there is continuing effort to fully integrate it with individual efforts Deltawide, but the Plan is not finalized.*
- Delta Risk Management Strategy. Develop a strategy that identifies risks to Delta levees, evaluates consequences, and recommends action by 2001.  
*Consultant is due to start work July 2002.*
- Best Management Practices for the Reuse of Dredged Material. Develop Plan by 2001.  
*Several projects are underway, including Sherman Berm and Jersey Island levee repair.*
- Use Bay and Delta Dredge Material for Delta Levee Repair and to Restore Delta Habitats. Target two million cubic yards applied in Stage 1.  
*In Years 1 and 2, 427,000 cubic yards of dredge material have been reused for levee maintenance.*

### Funding

Implementation of the CALFED program, as outlined in the ROD, has been uneven due to funding constraints. While hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on ecosystem restoration, only \$29.4 million has been allocated for levee system integrity, 39% of what is stated in the ROD goals. Funds for FY 2000-2001 were from Prop 13 and Prop 204. Funds for FY 2001 and 2002 were largely Prop 204 and 13, however, some General Fund money was made available.

### Fiscal Year 2002-2003:

The Governor's Budget proposed \$4.5 million for the Local Assistance portion of the Program, a reduction of approximately 2/3 of the base budget anticipated in authorizing legislation. An additional reduction of \$2.5 million is now proposed. The remaining \$2 million will only fund administration and oversight of the Delta Levees Program, and will eliminate all new work for the entire upcoming fiscal year. Some work is continuing under funds from previous fiscal years.

### CALFED Anticipated Levee Budget and Changes to Date:

The CALFED Framework for Action, Appendix A, outlines the project expenditures for CALFED programs. The Delta Levees Program was slated to expend \$264 million during years 1-7. Of those funds, \$88 million were to be State funds and \$34 million were to be local Reclamation District matching funds. An additional \$180 million was slated for implementation of a new levee program in the Suisun Marsh; no plan has yet been adopted by CALFED, so none of those funds have been needed to date.

For years one and two (FY 2000-2001 and FY 2001-2002) a total of \$29.4 in State funds has been allocated to the Delta Levees Program. In that period, no federal funds have been allocated to the Delta Levees Program.

**CALFED BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DELTA LEVEES SUBCOMMITTEE**

June 14, 2002

To: CALFED Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee

From: Delta Levees Subcommittee  
Co-Chairs Marci Coglianesse and Tom Zuckerman

Subject: Report from the Subcommittee

**Mission:** The mission of the Delta Levees Subcommittee is to coordinate between CALFED agencies and stakeholders on CALFED Levee Program issues and provide advice to the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee.

**Goals:**

- Coordinate stakeholder support for adequate Levee Program funding to achieve its goals and ROD commitments.
- Coordinate stakeholder support to balance environmental regulatory compliance with achieving Levee Program goals and ROD commitments.

**2002 Priorities:**

1. Make a recommendation to BDPAC on a short-term Levee Program funding source.

**Issue:**

The CALFED Delta Levees Program has been severely under-budgeted during the first two years of implementation, and is facing drastic additional cuts in the next fiscal year's State budget. These cuts threaten the stability of Delta levees and the integrity of the State and federal water projects. A brief history and description of the Delta Levees Program is attached.

**Report from the Subcommittee:**

The Delta Levee Subcommittee supports the following to ensure funding of the Delta levees program:

1. Support funding the Delta Levees Subvention Program at least at the pre-CALFED levels (\$12 million per year of State funds).
2. All funds allocated to the Special Projects component of the Levee Subvention program should be restricted to levee improvement projects. The CALFED program should recognize the funds that have been spent through the CALFED program for ecosystem benefits, and acknowledge that those expenditures will result in "net habitat improvement" in the Delta as required in Water Code Section 12311.

3. Pursue creation of a funds to offset shortfalls in the State budget, such as a fee linked to export of water from State and federal water systems to be earmarked for maintenance and upgrades to Delta levees, recognizing the levees are part of the water conveyance system for the State and federal water projects which are funded by such fees.
4. If new bond funds are approved by the voters in November 2002, or if federal funds become available at the start of the federal fiscal year (October 1) immediately restore the anticipated level of funding for the Levee Subvention program to the levels in the ROD and Implementation Plan.

### Levee Program Background:

The Delta Levees Subvention program was created by the State Legislature in 1973, and has been reauthorized in several subsequent bill. The current program has been incorporated into the CALFED program as one of the four original program components along with: ecosystem restoration, water quality, and water supply reliability.

### Funding Sources:

Implementation of the CALFED program, as outlined in the ROD, has been uneven due to funding constraints. While hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on CALFED ecosystem restoration, only \$ million dollars has been allocated for levee system integrity, \_\_\_% of the ROD goals. Funds FY 2000-2001 were from Prop 13 and Prop 204. Funds for FY 2001 and 2001 were largely Prop 204 and 13 and General Funds.

The Subvention program has been funded from several different sources, most recently from bonds and the general fund. The funds are used to administer the program (Department of Water Resources and Department of Fish and Game), to match local Reclamation District funds for on-going levee maintenance, and for "special projects" which include "net habitat improvement" in the Delta; levee projects on the eight western islands (Sherman, Twitchell, Jersey, Bethel, Bradford, Webb, and Holland Islands and Hotchkiss Tract; flood control for the Delta communities of Thornton and Walnut Grove; and other projects throughout the Delta). The funds for levee maintenance and special projects is traditionally split 50-50, but exceptions have been made in the past. The funds are spent throughout the 738,000-acre Legal Delta and the 1,100 miles of levees.

### CALFED Levee Program:

"The goal of the CALFED levee program is to provide long-term protection for multiple Delta resources by maintaining and improving the integrity of the extensive Delta levees system."

Delta Levee Subventions program provides funding for levee maintenance, mitigation for impacts from levee maintenance, and emergency response; source of funds is currently General Fund. Special Projects provides funding to improve and protect Delta levees, net habitat improvement, and is implemented through levee reconstruction, subsidence control, and reuse of dredged materials.

The CALFED Levee program consists of several elements:

- Base Level Protection. Help Reclamation Districts reconstruct all Delta levees to a base level of protection (the PL 84-99 standard). Currently about 520 out of 1,100 miles of Delta levees do NOT meet this standard. During Stage 1, about 200 additional miles of levee will be brought up to a base level of protection.  
*No additional levees have been brought to the base level of protection.*
- Special Projects. Enhance levee stability on levees that have particular importance in the system. Priorities include life and personal property, water quality, protection of agricultural production, and protecting ecosystems.  
*No levees have been enhanced under this program.*

- Levee Subsidence Control Plan. Develop "best management practices" to control and reverse subsidence and work with reclamation districts and landowners to implement cost-effective measures.  
*No best management practices have been developed.*
- Levee Emergency Response Plan. Enhance the ability of local, state and federal agencies to rapidly respond to levee emergencies. Prepare Plan by 2000.  
*Levee Emergency Response Plan has been prepared but not finalized.*
- Delta Risk Management Strategy. Develop a strategy that identifies risks to Delta levees, evaluates consequences, and recommends action by 2001.  
*Consultant is due to start work July 2002.*
- Best Management Practices for the Reuse of Dredged Material. Develop Plan by 2001.  
*No best management practices have been developed.*
- Use Bay and Delta Dredge Material for Delta Levee Repair and to Restore Delta Habitats. Target two million cubic yards applied in Stage 1.  
*\_\_\_\_\_ cubic yards of dredge material have been reused for levee maintenance in years 1 and 2.*

Fiscal Year 2002-2003:

Governor's Budget proposed \$4.5 million for the program, a reduction of approximately 2/3 of the base budget anticipated in authorizing legislation. And additional reduction of \$2.5 million is now proposed. The proposed funding will only fund administration and oversight of the program and will eliminate all new work for the entire upcoming fiscal year. Some work is continuing under funds from previous fiscal years.

CALFED Anticipated Levee Budget and Changes to Date:

The CALFED Framework for Action, Appendix A, outlines the project expenditures for CALFED programs. The Levees Program was slated to expend \$264 million years 1-7. Of those funds, \$88 were to be State funds and \$34 were local Reclamation District matching funds. An additional \$180 million were slated for implementation of a new levee program in the Suisun Marsh; no plan has yet been adopted by CALFED no none of those funds have been needed to date.

For years one and two (FY 2000-2001 and FY 2001-2002) a total of \$\_\_\_\_\_ in State funds has been allocated to the Delta levees program. In that period, no federal funds have been allocated to the Delta levees program.

Subcommittee on Drinking Water  
Draft Report  
on the Meeting of March 18, 2002  
to the  
Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on March 18, 2002 (the meeting agenda is attached).

***Meeting Summary***

Meeting notes of February 8, 2001

Meeting notes from last meeting were reviewed without comment.

Follow up from 3/12 BDPAC meeting

The Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) met on March 12, 2002, at which time DWS submitted its workplan to the Committee. Co-Chairs also recommended new members to the BDPAC chair. Last action item from the Subcommittee meeting on February 8, organizing a retreat or workshop meeting, is still in process. The major issues discussed at the BDPAC meeting were the funding and organization of the committee. Next meetings were scheduled in June, September and December. The September meeting will be held in Southern California and will focus on water quality. After the BDPAC meeting, the Chairs of each Subcommittee met as the Steering Committee to discuss how to integrate communications between Mr. Gary Hunt, the BDPAC Chair, and the Subcommittees.

Subcommittee membership

New members were announced; there are now 14 members of the Subcommittee. However, the Subcommittee is still looking for members with expertise in the watersheds, wastewater, and public health/epidemiology areas.

Report on current program activities and funding strategy

John Andrew presented on the CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program (DWQP) status. He reviewed the budget and funding sources of the DWQP in years 2000, 2001 and 2002, and also previewed the proposed budget for year 2003. John also reviewed the activities during year 2001 and presented the priorities of the DWQP for the next three years. DWQP will get \$20.5 million from Prop 40 with substantial additional funding possible if the water bond passes in November.

Issues/discussion

- How to cross-cut funding for projects under DWQP but with impacts/benefits in other CALFED programs areas. The Subcommittee discussed this issue and concluded that this group will help identify the linkages. The Subcommittee needs to cooperate with other subcommittees to ensure benefits to all programs.

- How can the DWS address under-funding in general and problems with balance associated with bond funding requirements? Adequate funding for each of the DWQP elements is important, but because of constraints in bond legislation, balance has not been achieved. Agricultural drainage/ runoff and treatment technology are currently lagging. The program needs to look for other funding sources to achieve the multiple objectives of the program.
- The Subcommittee would like to see reporting of projects and results.
- The Subcommittee would like the opportunity to provide general comments on future proposal solicitation packages.

### Role of the CALFED Agencies in the DWQP

In order to meet CALFED Drinking Water Quality goals, the Subcommittee also discussed the roles of the three major water quality agencies (i.e. USEPA, DHS and SWRCB) responsible for the program. These agencies should have an active role in both implementing and funding the CALFED Drinking Water Quality Program. Dave Spath (DHS), Karen Schwinn (USEPA), and Jim Bennett (SWRCB) reviewed their agencies' key responsibilities related to the DWQP. The Subcommittee concluded that the task is to develop, understand, and implement a strategic plan as a framework to provide funding priorities and guidance for agency collaboration.

***Action Items: Each of the three agencies will prepare a list of projects for public health needs and a summary of available water quality funding in California. This list should include priorities and how they were established to help the Subcommittee understand what kind of competition these drinking water projects are faced with. The list should be ready for the April 26 meeting.***

### Strategic Plan – including defining “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”

Marguerite Young presented a draft diagram showing the elements of the Delta drinking water supply system and its relationship to “an equivalent level of public health protection” (ELPH). She reviewed each component involved in the matrix of the system-wide solution related to ELPH. The Subcommittee discussed these issues in depth, and concluded that this could be the conceptual model used to develop its strategic plan.

### Issues/comments/ideas

- What is the most cost-effective combination of source control, water management, and treatment?
- The strategic plan should incorporate the “multiple barriers” concept.
- Subgroups of water utilities may need different strategies to achieve drinking water quality goals.
- Advances in treatment technology and current treatment trends have a bearing on the ELPH issue. For example, many utilities have already switched/committed to ozone.
- Risks associated with emerging pollutants/new regulations must be considered.
- The DWQP strategic plan should be similar to water supply integrated resources plans.

***Action Item: Members will forward comments, questions and suggestions to John Andrew by March 29. John will compile and add narrative to finalize the diagram.***

Next Meetings and agendas:

**April 5, 11:30 am to 2:30 pm**

Draft Agenda:

Subcommittee membership

Conceptual framework for a water quality strategic plan, including defining “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”

Establishment of technical workgroups

**April 26, 9:30 am to 3:30 pm**

Draft Agenda:

Water quality funding

Workshop: “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”

Subcommittee on Drinking Water  
Draft Report  
on the  
Meeting of April 5, 2002  
to the  
Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on April 5, 2002.

***Meeting Summary***

Meeting notes of March 18, 2001

The Subcommittee reviewed the meeting notes from the March 18, 2001 meeting without comment.

Subcommittee membership

The Subcommittee has met most of its membership goals both in numbers of members and expertise but it is still checking on one candidate in the wastewater recycling field and is still looking for members with expertise in watershed source control and public health/epidemiology. The chairs have a couple of candidates in mind, and will select one or two additional members shortly.

Conceptual framework for a water quality strategic plan, including defining “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”

The diagram of the Delta drinking water supply system and its relationship to “an equivalent level of public health protection” (ELPH) was revised based upon the comments from members. Changes were made, and new components added, to the diagram, including local water storage, CVP/SWP Operations and Storage, and Education/Outreach.

The Subcommittee first reviewed the initial concept of the diagram, which was created to help the Subcommittee focus on development of a strategic plan. In doing this, the Subcommittee needs to understand the Record of Decision water quality elements and interpret how ROD actions are related to the definition of An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection. The elements included in the diagram are related to a broad range of ROD actions affecting water quality in the Delta and subsequent treatment and distribution. The purpose of this strategy diagram is to create an intellectual framework, to guide selection of the most cost-effective solutions for CALFED and local water agencies.

Issues/comments/ideas

- “Delivered Water Quality” could be vastly different depending upon what is going into a local water system and how it is handled. In other words, even with the same source

water quality, due to different location, water treatment technology, or operation plans, the output could be vastly different.

- The Subcommittee looks to CALFED to take actions that would drive local infrastructure investments and operations decisions. CALFED agencies need to understand the infrastructure and provide financial and political supports.
- The ELPH diagram is currently only a simplified schematic. We will need higher level of knowledge of the details of the boxes listed in the diagram to create a more complete schematic at the workshop.
- The ELPH diagram is also a conceptual model, which is subjective and still needs to be negotiated. The common interest or bottom line is to deliver high quality water, even though optimally how to get there differs by region.
- Cost/benefit analysis should consider additional health benefits of advanced treatment technology. Advanced technology might have multiple benefits by removing a broad range of contaminants.
- The new added box of “Education/Outreach” is an important addition to the strategy diagram. The concept of “an equivalent level of public health *perception*” could be useful. Education and outreach programs convey the quality issue to the public, and perception could depend on the water quality this Subcommittee decides to achieve.
- Starting with current water quality standards, we can anticipate potential changes and have what-if scenarios for further analysis. This should help us expand the level of analysis, and the analysis will evolve with time as we get better knowledge of issues.
- Water quality regulation starts at the federal level (i.e. EPA), then it gets down to the State level (i.e. DHS), individual utilities, and finally comes to the customers themselves. “Standards” get stricter as you go down the ladder. The minimum levels (customer acceptance) should be our water quality improvement goals.
- “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection” is not just meeting health standards. It also means achieving a certain level of health risk. Standards are not what we are shooting for. Public health protection is the goal.
- The box of “Public education and outreach” is not just at the bottom of this conceptual model. In fact, it goes alongside from top to bottom. However, it is not necessary to show direct connections to the diagram boxes.
- Hydrology is implicit in the “Conveyance/Delta Operations” component.

#### Things to do for the workshop:

The goal for next workshop is to gather information and ideas to help develop the details for the boxes (i.e. components) of the framework.

The Subcommittee was interested to learn more about major CALFED improvements affecting Delta water quality, regional water quality blending/exchanges, water treatment options, and the concept of ELPH, at its next meeting on April 26.

#### Water quality project priority: Advanced treatment studies

Gartrell reviewed the draft memo he prepared for the meeting, which the Subcommittee discussed in-depth.

Issues/comments/ideas

- Improving in-Delta water quality is not just dependent on CALFED Water Quality Program actions but is also linked to other CALFED programs, such as conveyance and storage improvements.
- The feasibility and cost of advanced treatment technology is essential to evaluation of all water quality improvement projects.
- CALFED should place a high priority on funding and implementing advanced treatment technology studies.
- Local water agencies may already be performing some or most of the advanced treatment studies suggested by the memo.
- While supportive of the memo, Tim Quinn challenged the assertion that such studies are needed for CEQA/NEPA and 404 purposes.
- Studies should cover the entire geographic range of Delta water use instead of being limited to one spot.
- The first phase of the studies suggested by the memo (i.e. current state of knowledge re: treatment technology) could be performed directly by CALFED agency staff.
- The Subcommittee should appoint a technical committee to track and report on the progress of the studies and to provide feedback.
- Memo implies that CALFED has not made treatment technology a high priority when in fact DWQP specifically requested such studies in its PSP.

***Action Items: Gartrell will revise memo.***Establishment of technical workgroups

The Subcommittee is interested in establishing technical workgroups to help the Subcommittee and the Drinking Water Quality Program move forward on specific subjects.

Workgroups in the following five technical areas were suggested:

- Treatment Technology
- Source Water Protection
- Blending/Exchanges
- An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection (ELPH)
- Public Education

***Action Items: John will establish technical groups through an open process. The Subcommittee can nominate members or they can self-nominate.***Public Comments

John reported on two follow-up items to the Subcommittee:

- Reimbursement policy for travel expense has been drafted in a memo that may be available at next meeting on April 26.

- In response to the suggestion from the Subcommittee members, the Drinking Water Quality Program (DWQP) will do more reporting to the general public on projects funded by the DWQP. Specifically, by July 1, DWQP will establish a web-based project tracking system of all projects funded.

Agenda for workshop on April 26

Workshop: “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”

Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
Subcommittee on Drinking Water  
Draft Minutes  
Meeting of April 26, 2002

The Drinking Water Subcommittee met on April 26, 2002 (meeting agenda attached).

***Meeting Summary***

Draft minutes April 5, 2002

Gartrell suggested three corrections:

Page 3 – under “Issues/comments/ideas”:

- change bullet item “Local agencies may already ...” to “Some local agencies may already ...”
- change bullet item regarding Quinn comment on need for studies in CEQA/NEPA and 404 processes. Comment was that not all Delta water conveyance project CEQA/NEPA and 404 processes would require information from advanced treatment studies.
- add comment that memo should be addressed to BDPAC instead of directly to CALFED.

Memorandum on Advanced Treatment Studies

Gartrell indicated that he had revised the memo along the lines of the comments from the April 5 meeting. Memo should be addressed to BDPAC instead of CALFED and would transmit the memo to BDPAC.

Introductions

Members (including three new members) and attendees introduced themselves (attendance list attached).

**Workshop: “An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection”**

Goals of workshop were to provide background information on the issues related to the charge of the Drinking Water Subcommittee and to identify elements, issues, and steps necessary to development of the strategic plan. Focus was on the concept of “an equivalent level of public health protection” and the strawman diagram developed by the subcommittee.

Presentations were given in four subject areas:

- CALFED Water Quality Targets
- Water Quality Exchanges
- Treatment Technology
- Delta Water Quality/CALFED Improvements

Speakers' slides for each presentation will be posted on the Drinking Water Subcommittee web page ([http://calfed.water.ca.gov/bdpac/Subcommittees/drinking\\_water\\_quality\\_subcommittee\\_content.htm](http://calfed.water.ca.gov/bdpac/Subcommittees/drinking_water_quality_subcommittee_content.htm)). Questions, comments, and issues are recorded here.

## 1. CALFED Water Quality Targets

Presentation – *CALFED Water Quality Targets*, Douglas M. Owen, Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. (presentation was given by speakerphone accompanied by PowerPoint slides).

Presentation summarized the work of the CUWA expert panel in developing the recommendations in the report titled “Bay-Delta Water Quality Evaluation,” the follow-up letter report, and the implications of current regulatory environment and knowledge.

Presentation – *USEPA Drinking Water Regulatory Update*, Bruce Macler, USEPA Region 9

### Issues/comments/ideas

- Changes to the monitoring/averaging method and raw water quality variability make the current regulation more restrictive in effect than the 80/60 standard would suggest. Type of disinfection used and system variables can have a dramatic effect. Another way to look at it may be that while source quality is still important, that issues within the local distribution system may be equally or more important.
- A summary of California regulatory framework is needed.
- Public Health Goals in California are an issue for drinking water utilities.
- Br – then and now. Assumed change from 10 to 5 has not happened. Does availability of UV change the conclusions?
- We are not done with the evolution of drinking water regulations especially related to bromide.
- Disinfection method and byproducts in distribution systems. Chlorination – is it a given or are there other options?
- There may be other reasons (e.g. security, other DBPs) for choosing chlorine vs. chloramine.
- Multiple health benefits, including reproductive health need to be considered.
- Delta source water quality improvement/protection is important. Another barrier and provides flexibility in treatment.
- Pathogen and other contaminant loadings in the delta are also of concern.
- What is the role of conservation in the drinking water quality program? (quantity vs. quality)
- Residuals management – environment vs. human protection

## 2. Water Quality Exchanges

Presentation – *Briefing on Water Quality Exchange Partnerships*, Steve Hirsch, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Presentation – *Bay Area Blending/Exchange Program*, Cindy Darling, CALFED Bay-Delta Program

(BAB/E name has been changed to “Bay Area Water Quality and Supply Reliability Program”.)

Issues/comments/ideas

- Was blending only considered? What about source protection?
- Relationship to other CALFED program elements (multiple benefits, no redirected impacts)
- Who are the locals? What are the local impacts?
- Other communities are not part of the partnerships. Particularly communities in the Valley (source area). This was a comment about the small drinking water systems that are in the Friant-Kern service area...and that they need to be at the table.
- Are there opportunities to improve water quality for local communities in the source area?
- Fear of cooperation is a challenge
- Ag or other upstream partners for BAB/E?
- Role of conservation and recycling – ag and urban
- Broader public outreach
- Ground water contaminants and conjunctive use may be a barrier
- Quantification of water quality and quantity in all projects is important.
- (for BAB/E) – exchange of treated water rather than source water

3. Treatment Technology

Presentation – *Drinking Water Treatment Technologies*, Brad Coffey, Metropolitan Water District

Issues/comments/ideas

- What is the effect of source water quality variability on treatment?
- Direct Delta users have much greater water quality variability.
- UV validation – how do scale-up for large systems.
- Is use of chlorine instead of chloramine even feasible with current Delta water quality?
- Stability of water in distribution systems (biological and DBPs)
- Standardization of technologies for widespread application/cost reduction
- Multiple water quality benefits of different treatment technologies.
- Regulations are a moving target. We need to be looking ahead.
- Challenge of treating blended water sources. Systems must be capable of handling a wide range of source water quality.

4. Delta Water Quality/CALFED Improvements

Presentation – Dave Briggs, Contra Costa Water District,

Presentation – Randall Neudeck, Metropolitan Water District

#### Issues/comments/ideas

- Improvements in water quality vs. maintaining the status quo
- Water quality as a criterion for major CALFED storage and conveyance projects. Put water quality on an equal footing with supply and environmental considerations.
- Modeling in support of decision making should include water quality, not just fish (environmental impacts) and water supply.
- Degradation of water quality by other CALFED actions
- Storage statewide to benefit water quality
- Source control; Delta Drinking Water Quality policy
- Briefings are needed by USEPA Region IX, RWQCB, CUWA, SAWPA, Water Forum on tools for improving/protecting drinking water.
- Future demands on water quality. Contamination of groundwater is shifting demand from ground water to surface water.
- Is drinking water on a level playing field relative to other beneficial uses? What is the role of the TMDL process in protecting drinking water?
- Relative importance of pollutant sources and costs of source control must be balanced with benefits.
- Water supply and connection to water quality.

#### General comments on the Workshop

- We need to keep a drought scenario in mind.
- Presentations today have been general and that's good but we will need to get much more specific and detailed in future meetings.

#### Conceptual framework for a water quality strategic plan, including defining “An Equivalent level of Public Health protection”

Latest version of the ELPH diagram was distributed.

#### Public comments/issues

- More balance in CALFED projects – more funding should go to small land owners.
- Impact of State Water Project water on ground water basins. Use of conjunctive use in blending/exchange is anything but certain. It is generally prohibited.
- The subcommittee should apply pressure on the Regional Board to make the Drinking Water Policy a priority.
- Relevance of 50 µg/l bromide target with development of new water treatment technologies.
- Should we be working with the Storage Subcommittee on the potential water quality impacts of projects such as Delta Wetlands?

- Other contaminant impacts on water treatment plants

Other business

The BDPAC Environmental Justice Subcommittee has asked that the Drinking Water Subcommittee give a presentation at one of their future meetings

*Action Item: CALFED DWQ staff will summarize workshop comments/issues and will put the presentations on the web site.*

Next Meeting

**May 31, 2002 - 9:30 a.m. to 1230 p.m.**

Draft Agenda:

1. Meeting notes of April 26, 2002
2. Follow-up on Workshop: "An Equivalent Level of Public Health Protection"
  - lessons learned
  - information gaps
3. Presentation on the Water Bond
4. Agency Funding Summaries; DHS, EPA

# **BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE**

## **Meeting Summary**

---

**Meeting Date/Location:** February 22, 2002  
California Energy Commission  
Hearing Room A  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

---

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Lelie Lohse, Environmental Justice Subcommittee co-chair, began the meeting with a welcome and introductions of all in attendance at the meeting (attachment A).

### **Introductory Comments**

Wendy Halverson-Martin, Deputy Director CALFED Bay-Delta Program, presented an overview regarding the roles and responsibilities of the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) appointed Environmental Justice Subcommittee. She indicated that this Subcommittee is new and thus is less visible at this time, and stressed its importance in advancing the commitment to advance environmental justice in the CALFED Program. The Subcommittee will be counted on to have direct contacts with Program Managers, and use political and other means to influence programs and CALFED agencies and departments to meet the commitment to identify and address environmental justice issues in CALFED Program activities.

### **Status of the Bay-Delta Advisory Committee (BDPAC) and Subcommittees**

Eugenia Laychak, CALFED/BDPAC, provided a status report on BDPAC and its Subcommittees. She stated that Secretary of the Interior Gail Norton signed BDPAC's charter during June 2001. Members were approved in October 2001, and the first official meeting was held December 5, 2001. It was at this meeting that BDPAC appointed the Environmental Justice Subcommittee. The purpose of BDPAC is to advise and assist implementation of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. Ms. Laychak presented a diagram illustrating the organizational structure of BDPAC and its Subcommittees. The diagram depicted BDPAC as reporting to the CALFED Policy Group, which is overseen by the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Resources. Ms. Laychak stated that in addition to BDPAC Subcommittees, public work groups had been convened and will report to BDPAC,. Examples of some public work groups include the Delta Protection Commission, North Delta

Improvements Group, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG/CALFED Task Force), and the Battle Creek Conservancy.

Ms. Laychak then provided a discussion on the need to develop a strong connection between BDPAC and the Subcommittee. She concluded by informing the meeting participants that BDPAC will be looking for help from the Environmental Justice Subcommittee to set priorities and assist with Program balance and integration.

## **Discussion**

Ms. Laychak was asked about integration of environmental justice in the CALFED Program, and she indicated that one possible way this could be done is through participation in other BDPAC appointed Subcommittees that have approved which are:

- ◆ Watershed
- ◆ Ecosystem
- ◆ Water Use Efficiency
- ◆ Drinking Water Quality
- ◆ Water Management
- ◆ Levees and Habitat
- ◆ Environmental Justice

A question was asked regarding Subcommittee membership. Most Subcommittees have formal membership while the Watershed Subcommittee has open membership. The membership can be either way, with the key is to be inclusive as possible to be effective. She was asked how to have people with an interest and knowledge of environmental justice to become members on Subcommittees. She responded that a number of Subcommittees already have members with an environmental justice interest and that all Subcommittee meetings are open to the public for anyone interested to attend. The Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee has a vacant environmental justice membership position and solicits a recommendation(s) for consideration.

A discussion was held regarding the possibility of participation in Environmental Justice Subcommittee meetings by teleconference for those who cannot attend in person. Virginia Cahill, CALFED Legal Counsel, indicated this must not violate the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act of 2002 that governs notice and open meeting requirements. To have teleconference participation, the call-in locations must be at pre-determined satellite sites that are indicated in meeting announcements. Wendy Halverson-Martin indicated this was a possibility to pursue should this be the desire of the Subcommittee.

The final discussion related to the need for a summary report for each Subcommittee meeting for use by BDPAC and others interested in the activities of the Environmental Justice Subcommittee.

## **Environmental Justice Subcommittee Description**

The next meeting discussion was in regards to formation and function of the Subcommittee. This discussion began with the resources identified to support environmental justice activities in the CALFED Program. Currently, the one-half time position of Interim Environmental Justice Coordinator is staffed by Dan Wermiel including some staff support. There is a desire expressed by the Subcommittee to identify and dedicate resources for an Environmental Justice Coordinator including resources to support the Subcommittee and advance environmental justice in the CALFED Program. Wendy Halverson-Martin discussed the attempt to hire Torri Estrada, Latino Issue Forum, to fill this position through a federal IPA. This did not succeed because the Bureau of Reclamation expressed that because federal authorization of CALFED has expired and environmental justice is not a specific program under which BOR can spend funds, they lack authority for funding to support this position and were unwilling to execute the IPA.

There is currently activity to attempt to solve the resource situation at the federal or State level, such as seeking a hiring exemption through the CA Dept. of Finance. A number of participants expressed the immediate need to resolve these problems and get the resources for an Environmental Justice Coordinator and other needs. Subcommittee participants can assist in this by determining options and developing a course of action. It was decided by the Subcommittee to elevate the need for resources to support environmental justice to BDPAC.

## **Mission**

The mission of the Environmental Justice Subcommittee is contained in the draft description in which the key is to ensure that implementation of the CALFED Program benefits minority, Tribal, low income and other potentially impacted communities and populations. The goal of the Subcommittee includes integration of environmental justice in all CALFED Program elements.

## **Roles and Responsibilities**

The draft description includes the main roles and responsibilities of the Subcommittee. In addition, there was discussion of the need for education as a tool to successfully advance environmental justice. The Environmental Justice Subcommittee can provide education to agencies and departments that will more effectively help CALFED meet its goal and objectives.

Another tool discussed was to utilize public affairs to include environmental justice in CALFED publications for outreach and education purposes. CALFED newsletters, annual reports and public forums should contain discussions of environmental justice activities.

## **Outcomes**

There was discussion of the outcomes in the Subcommittee description, and of the goal to have environmental justice to be included as a component within Program elements and not a topic to be considered separately. This could include environmental justice as a component of criteria for PSP's and RFP's, and for individuals with interest and knowledge of environmental justice to be included on selection panels for project funding decisions. There is a desire characterize that an desirable outcome of environmental justice is avoiding an adverse impact.

The Environmental Justice Subcommittee noted that it would be of interest to determine what environmental justice impacts there have been from the current or past activities of the CALFED Program.

## **Membership**

The discussion regarding membership in the Subcommittee focused on the desire to be as inclusive as possible to advance environmental justice in the CALFED Program. Therefore, the model of the Watershed Workgroup will be used, in that all participants who attend a Subcommittee meeting will a member. This approach will be monitored to ensure that there is participation by individuals from each of the CALFED regions and to solicit as many participants representing diverse interests as possible.

## **Frequency and Location of Meetings**

The Environmental Justice Subcommittee decided it would be best to hold meetings on a regular monthly schedule of the second Friday of each month. The co-chairs would decide as a regular agenda item at each meeting whether or not to hold a meeting in the subsequent month or not. The meetings would generally be planned from 10:00 am until 3:00 pm. The co-chairs would develop the agenda for each Subcommittee meeting.

To make the Subcommittee as inclusive as possible, the meetings will be moved to locations in each of the five CALFED regions, as resources provide. The Sacramento meetings would generally focus on policy and Program issues, while the regional meetings would generally include issues of outreach and education.

It was decided to explore the possibility of participation in Environmental Justice Subcommittee meetings by teleconference for those who cannot attend in person that would be consistent with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act of 2002 that governs notice and open meeting requirements. Call-in locations options will be considered for participation by teleconference at pre-determined satellite sites that must be indicated in meeting announcements.

## **Subgroups**

The co-chairs of the Subcommittee may convene subgroups of the Environmental Justice Subcommittee on an as needed basis to accomplish specific tasks. The subgroups meetings will be open to the public and may be held between formal meetings of the Subcommittee and will report back progress and recommendations to the Subcommittee at regularly scheduled meetings.

## **Resources**

A high priority identified at the meeting is a need for resources to support the Subcommittee and advancement of environmental justice in the CALFED Program. This includes hiring an Environmental Justice Coordinator and dedicated staff and resources for additional needs such as outreach in the CALFED regions. There is currently a lack of adequate identified resources to meet the commitment to environmental justice. The Subcommittee will elevate this issue to BDPAC.

## **Communications/Outreach**

The Subcommittee discussed the need for enhanced outreach and communication regarding environmental justice in the CALFED Program. Public documents and public presentations should include discussion of environmental justice to legitimize and advance this commitment. Resources are needed to support greater outreach in the CALFED regions.

There was discussion of the need to include environmental justice in a more visible format on the CALFED webpage, and to link to other websites including that of the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water at [www.ejwatercoalition.org](http://www.ejwatercoalition.org).

## **Annual Priorities for the Subcommittee**

The discussion of annual priorities was intended to make initial recommendations to BDPAC. The draft recommended priorities (2002) for the Environmental Justice Subcommittee were captured on a flipchart, and included:

- Expanding core participants to include all CALFED regions
- Hire dedicated staff, including an Environmental Justice Coordinator, and resources to support the Subcommittee and advancement of environmental justice in the CALFED Program
- Environmental justice representative at all BDPAC Subcommittees
- Implement Tier 1 of the Environmental Justice Workplan
- Include environmental justice activities and updates of the Subcommittee in CALFED publications and on the CALFED webpage
- CALFED public presentations should include environmental justice

- Incorporate environmental justice in psp's, funded projects and project outreach efforts.

### **Annual Outcomes and Success Measurement for 2002**

There was discussion that the BDPAC had requested each Subcommittee present initial success measures so that at the end of the year the Subcommittee could determine it's level of effectiveness. The Subcommittee developed initial draft success measures on a flipchart which include:

Identification of resources for dedicated staff and other needs to meet the commitment to environmental justice

Integration of the Environmental Justice subcommittee with other CALFED Subcommittees and Programs

Revise the Environmental Justice Workplan and Preliminary 2001 Environmental Justice Annual Plan

The Subcommittee wanted a status report developed by the interim Coordinator and support from Subcommittee members regarding past accomplishments to date identified in the Workplan.

Final discussions included a possible strategy of selecting one important priority environmental justice issue on which there could be tangible results. One suggestion is to transfer the Water Use Efficiency Model from the Southern CA region to the Bay area.

The co-chair selected April 12, 2002, for the next Environmental Justice Subcommittee meeting to be held in Sacramento.

# **BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE**

## **Meeting Summary**

---

**Meeting Date/Location:** April 12, 2002  
Resources Building  
Suite 1131  
1416 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA

---

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Martha Guzman, Environmental Justice Subcommittee Co-chair, began the meeting with a welcome and introductions of all in attendance at the meeting.

### **Meeting Notes of February 22, 2002, Environmental Justice Subcommittee Meeting and Follow-up from BDPAC Meeting**

The meeting summary from the previous Environmental Justice Subcommittee meeting was reviewed. The accomplishments of tasks in the Environmental Justice Work Plan were discussed. This included discussion of the Environmental Justice Regional Workshops. Among issues related to environmental justice that were identified at the workshops is the need for resources including an Environmental Justice Coordinator. This was also a key discussion elevated to the BDPAC meeting. Wendy Halverson-Martin, Asst. Director, CALFED, indicated that CALFED Program is committed to hire an Environmental Justice Coordinator. There has been a \$22 million cut in the general fund support for the CALFED Program and there is another additional cut in the current year budget. These significantly impact the CALFED budget and abilities to meet the needs and commitments for the CALFED Program. Discussions are underway for the Secretary of Interior to move funds to the EPA to support the Environmental Justice Coordinator position or to provide direct support to use resources for the position. Resources Agency Secretary Nicols has indicated a priority to fill this position. More information regarding status to hire a Coordinator will be provided at the next Subcommittee meeting.

There is no revenue as a discrete line item in the current budget to support environmental justice activities. The Subcommittee discussion indicated stakeholders from the environmental justice communities may go to the legislature to support CALFED so that it can meet it's commitment to environmental justice.

The Subcommittee expressed that it did not want to see advancement of environmental justice compromised due to resource issues. The participants in the Subcommittee are investing time and effort to assist CALFED, and do not want this to be lost due to lack of resources. There should be assurance to provide for the Environmental Justice Coordinator plus to meet the priorities in the Environmental Justice Work Plan and identified by the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee wants clarity about resources on the table available to implement the Work Plan. Resource issues remain a priority and should have proportional support for environmental justice.

The Subcommittee indicated that it would assist in providing support to secure funds needed to advance environmental justice. This includes both State funds and federal support through the BOR for environmental justice activities.

Integration with the California Biodiversity Council (CBC) was identified as a possible mechanism to provide education and gain support to advance environmental justice. It was suggested to consider coordination with the CBC for a future meeting with an environmental justice theme and to nurture a relationship and promote awareness of environmental justice issues.

The Governance bill was discussed which would provide CALFED ability to control budget internally. The Subcommittee would like funds for environmental justice specifically earmarked in the Governance bill.

### **Strategy of Action Required to Develop a Revised Environmental Justice Work Plan and Annual Plan**

The Subcommittee supports priorities identified in the Work Plan and wants to determine the resources needed for these priorities. This includes the Coordinator and other needs, and will defend the resources to meet these commitments and advance environmental justice in the CALFED Program.

The Subcommittee wants to revise the Work Plan and use this to set the course for development of an Annual Plan. Integration with other CALFED Program elements and Subcommittees is needed to effectively accomplish this. The approach will be to invite Program Managers and Subcommittee Co-chairs to Environmental Justice Subcommittee meetings. There can be mutual exchange of what the Program elements do and where there is environmental justice related activities and issues and so strategies for solutions can be developed. The goal is to integrate environmental justice into Program elements to address environmental justice issues.

The Water Use Efficiency Program and Watershed Program will be featured at the next Environmental Justice Subcommittee meeting. Program Managers will be asked to attend as will Subcommittee Co-chairs. This will be a first step towards the goal of integration of environmental justice in the CALFED Program elements. The Program Managers and Co-chairs will be asked to review the Work Plan and Annual Plan and provide input where environmental justice related actions are identified to be addressed.

The unedited notes from the Regional Environmental Justice Workshops will be circulated along with the Work Plan and Annual Plan to Program Managers who will be asked to review this material and provide input regarding integration of environmental justice in Program actions.

Talking points were discussed that would provide education and background regarding environmental justice. This includes description and definition of environmental justice and quality of life issues. Also, the reasons for doing environmental justice including legal authority and to address the goals of the CALFED Program. A matrix will be developed identifying issues and examples of integration will be provided. The Work Plan will be summarized with definition of priority CALFED activities such as the need for agency and department liaisons and other identified needs. The ROD commitment to environmental justice will be highlighted. It is planned for an environmental justice presentation for BDPAC at the September meeting.

### **Planning for Next Environmental Justice Subcommittee Meeting**

The next Subcommittee meeting will be May 10, 2002, in Sacramento.

**CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Draft Meeting Summary**

---

**Meeting Date/Location:** May 10, 2002  
Resources Building, Room 1131  
1416 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

---

- Welcome and Introduction by Martha Guzman (EJ Subcommittee Co-Chair)
- Announcement that Martha Davis, the Watershed Subcommittee Co-Chair, will participate via telephone
- Request for comments to the notes from last month's meeting. These notes and the California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) packet will be posted on the CALFED web page. Notes from meetings will be provided to all participants and available on the CALFED web page expediently. Workshop notes, with exception of the Richmond Workshop, have not yet been transcribed because of resource issues.

**Integration with CALFED Program Elements**

**Water Use Efficiency Program – guest speaker:**

**Tom Gohring, CALFED Water Use Efficiency Program Manager**

- For the purpose of encouraging a dialogue between the committee and the speakers, no formal presentation was prepared. The concept for the program from the CALFED ROD to the implementation stage is to support local programs and practices that support the four CALFED objectives: 1) ecosystem restoration, 2) improving drinking water quality, 3) improving the levee system and 4) water supply reliability.
- The agricultural program links water quantity and timing. The goal is to increase the usable water supply through reduction of diversion and an increase in stream reaches.
- The urban program involves funding local programs with grants and loans. This presents a potential connection in EJ communities because of the 3 pronged approach: 1) local programs, 2) good science (verifying benefits) and 3) a set of assurance packages. Urban issues require a more regulatory approach, certifying best management packages.
- Tom Gohring expressed agreement with the Potential Environmental Justice Issues chart. The link between EJ issues and Water Use Efficiency is avoiding negative

impacts. An example of this is technology-based canal systems impacting agricultural labor.

- One notable success story is the Mothers of East LA water resources/toilet rebate program. However, EJ concepts are often not understood by the people looking at proposals, thus not everything is being done to be sensitive to EJ issues.
- EJ Subcommittee members interjected with a discussion of EJ policy and its role beyond mitigation. The subcommittee addressed the deficiency in the proposal process, where projects that do not necessarily fall under one particular program description go unsupported. For example, a Community Service District proposal to increase water use efficiency with groundwater recharge, while also improving water quality of the aquifer, did not receive funding from the Water Use Efficiency Program and fared very low in the Conjunctive Use proposal process. Tom responded that the objective is to spend money wisely. The effect is that only projects that match specific criteria are funded. The issue is that a process for sharing resources has not been institutionalized.
- The EJ Subcommittee commented that beyond mitigation and avoiding disproportionate hardships, another aspect of EJ is proactive implementation. For instance, at-risk young adults can participate in proposals.
- Tom suggested that methods for writing requests for proposals should not close doors to urban, minority or low-income communities. The EJ Subcommittee commented that the engagement of communities that have not been involved in the past with water issues at the local level is the goal of integrating the CALFED programs. The goal is also to make sure that the same communities that have always received funding do not continue to receive funding without regard to other communities just entering the process. Bay View/Hunters Point was identified as a key location in the SF Bay Area where a technology-based water use efficiency program could be very effective because of the high rate of home ownership.
- The group discussed the multi-step process for involving EJ communities in the funding process. The steps identified were 1) letting people know about the program, 2) providing assistance and help with preparing the proposal and 3) evaluation. The group determined that the programs are still in the incipient stages of determining how to reach and inform communities and provide technical assistance. The EJ Subcommittee suggested that “capacity building” should be incorporated. It behooves CALFED programs to recognize that minority population such as American Indian tribes can provide inside knowledge on how to best utilize resources. School education was identified as a starting point for informing and engaging communities.
- The EJ Subcommittee asked for guidance on how to most effectively work with the Water Use Efficiency Program. Tom suggested that an EJ member on the Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee would be a good start. The group agreed that linkages between the 2 programs are substantial. The Co-Chairs of the EJ Subcommittee

agreed to set up a meeting with the Co-Chairs of the Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee, this would be an open forum with the public invited. Martha also accepted the action step to contact Gary Bobker, a BDPAC member from The Bay Institute, to hold an Environmental Justice meeting with the BDPAC (see Action Items Chart on p. 8). The group determined that EJ education need to extend to BDPAC.

- The group began a discussion about the necessity for cooperative pro-action. If EJ communities are not aware of opportunities, ensuring their involvement may need to be action from the top down. A suggestion was presented that a designated percentage of proposal funding could be set aside for EJ communities. The group discussed the possibility that this action could require legislation and whether the EJ Subcommittee would be willing to pursue the implementation. The Subcommittee considered that identifying tangible targets for integration of EJ could set up a quantifiable scenario for determining progress. A suggestion to create a minimum percentage (such as 5%) of proposal funds going to EJ communities sparked the conversation that this could be beneficial because it could function as an opportunity to see how and if the number could be reached or why it could not be reached. The possibility that a minimum percentage could be limiting to the potential number of dollars allotted to EJ community proposals was also discussed.
- The group discussed the common ingredients of successful projects in low-income, rural and minority communities (i.e. cleanup of former log mills, Mothers of East LA). The ingredients identified were 1) a linchpin person with vision and influence and 2) an external, community-based organization to frame the program.
- Tom accepted the requests of the EJ Subcommittee to 1) look into the possibility of setting proposal funds aside to EJ communities, 2) provide technical assistance and 3) follow through on putting EJ representatives on the Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee. Tom did express concern about resource constraints. The group agreed that coordination between subcommittees will help with the integration of EJ and that EJ could be a forcing function within CALFED.
- The EJ Subcommittee asked when the next proposal solicitation package (PSP) will be issued for the Water Use Efficiency Program. Tom responded that no funding is available for the next PSP, however a water bond will be on the November ballot. If funding comes through, the next PSP will be in fiscal year 2004.
- Tom emphasized that the WUE Program Plan is a work in process and intended to be co-invented with public advisory participation. Tom suggested that the members of EJ Subcommittee review the document and provide comments. The next Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee meeting is on June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2002.
- The group returned to the subject of determining a minimum percentage of proposal funds for EJ community projects. Suggestions for setting this up included formulation of a structured request will validate the action at the higher levels and

looking at what types of programs have received PSP funding in the past gives insight into an appropriate percentage. The group determined that solicitation and recruiting activities could be effective if lists of EJ communities, projects and allotted funds are created and utilized. As a starting point, the State Board has a list of “small, disadvantaged communities,” as defined by population and median income, for regulation of Prop. 13 funds.

- The group segued into a discussion of coordinating meetings and schedules with the Water Use Efficiency Program. The group proposed coordination between EJ and other programs at community events. The group discussed several success stories including Santa Clara County, The Regional Task Force, Hunters Point and Association of Bay Area Governments. The Colorado River project (Dr. Susan Michaels) is a point of interest because of labor rights issues. Another significant EJ issue is tribal water rights. The group agreed to look into these organizations and projects to see how EJ is being incorporated.
- The EJ Subcommittee asked about the effectiveness of previous CALFED EJ Training. Tom commented that including EJ as a “case study” at an already planned event would be more effective. A participant from the Watershed Subcommittee commented that demonstrating successful projects and program momentum would propel the integration of EJ. When other programs see that the EJ constituency is willing to do something, they will want to be involved.

**Watershed Program – panel included:**

**John Lowrie, CALFED Watershed Program Manager**

**Martha Davis, Watershed Subcommittee Co-Chair (via speaker telephone)**

**Robert Meacher, Watershed Subcommittee Co-Chair**

- John Lowrie provided a Venn diagram to demonstrate the integration between 1) watershed communities’ (often farming communities, people of color) interests, goals & objectives 2) CALFED Program overall objectives and 3) tools such as technical assistance, education & outreach, contracting and review of proposals. The panel reported that EJ and Watershed have the strongest connection because of stakeholder and community involvement. Typically communities are invested in watershed issues because the watershed is essential to their livelihood. Tweaking of the tools can ensure more sensitivity to goals of full integration of EJ in every project. The EJ Subcommittee can encourage support of community-based efforts with specific EJ criteria for funding.
- The EJ Subcommittee asked for a specific definition and defining geographic range of a watershed. The Subcommittee also asked how the Watershed Program has evaluated EJ issues coming up in their projects and areas. The Watershed panel responded that narrowly focused projects without community involvement do not receive funding. The group agreed that this process should be a model for PSP selection. The Watershed panel reported that the Drinking Water Quality Program and the Watershed Program worked together and went outside CALFED to establish

this approach. The two programs had to jointly solicit the approach to the State Board and still the agencies are not fully convinced. However, the agencies are sold on soliciting concept proposals. Within a competitive framework, these concept proposals would develop into full proposals with the help of technical assistance provided by the programs.

- The EJ Subcommittee asked if the Watershed Program had identified specific geographical areas where they are not participating in projects. The Watershed panel responded that these areas have not been identified and that the program is in the initial implementation stages of learning more about where to extend the program. The goal of the program is to make strategic investments to pay off dividends. The first 1-3 years will be an evaluation process to discover relationships and refine implementation. Follow-up will include future outreach, finding gaps in the process, targeting low-income communities and determining if these communities have the potential to maximize the CALFED Program goals. The Watershed panel also offered the suggestion that the evaluation of concept proposals should be conducted by subject specific panels and should be timed so that comments can be provided to improve the final proposal. Expertise within agencies should be utilized on evaluation panels to provide a more meaningful CALFED-based approach. This CALFED-based approach has often been very focussed on technological solutions, and the challenge has been to convince communities to agree with the solutions. An improvement of the CALFED-based approach would be to communicate with communities to determine if their goals & objectives can be involved in CALFED goals and funding. Expanding the policy to include a broader, integrated perspective hinges on ensuring that community-based proposals have an adequate level of scientific basis.
- Olin Webb from the Bay View/Hunters Point community asked about the flow of funding to approved projects, specifically to his communities' project. The Watershed panel responded that 50 projects approved for funding have hit a bottleneck in the contract stage and only 10 have actually received contracts. Issues with turning funding over to the projects is a barrier that must be addressed in CALFED overall. CALFED projects that receive Prop. 13 funding are allowed by law to receive 25% of funding up front, whereas projects funded by the state's General Fund receive funding on a reimbursable basis.
- Sustainability of projects after funding is depleted is also a concern for rural, low-income and minority communities. The counties of Santa Clara and Los Angeles are examples of communities with extraordinary resources at the local level. Lack of resources in rural communities continues to be an issue. Olin Webb added that his community has partnered with the SF Dept. of Public Works to generate income. Sustainability for the Hunters Point community is not as much of a concern as getting their initial funding from CALFED.
- The group suggested traveling meetings as an opportunity to inform communities about upcoming PSPs. Traveling meetings also provide an opportunity to help

communities make a connection between what they want to do and how CALFED can help. Contracting and logistical issues should be revisited at coordinated regional workshops.

- The Watershed panel commented that Prop. 40 is a potential future source of funding for their program. There is urgency to get something in writing regarding the SB23 money so that it can be processed by the Dept. of Water Resources. The Watershed and Water Quality programs are at risk of losing the money if this does not get figured out. The EJ Subcommittee suggested that the EJ Coalition for Water should be contacted regarding this matter.

### **12:45 p.m. Lunch Break**

### **1:30 p.m. Resource Issues and Priority Tasks for Subcommittee**

#### **Handouts: Existing job description for EJ Coordinator and the 2002-03 Work Plan/Budget**

- CALFED Deputy Director Wendy Halverson Martin restarted the meeting with the good news that the hiring of the EJ Coordinator had been approved on the Federal side. Torri Estrada from the Latino Issues Forum and Environmental Justice Coalition for Water was offered the job, however he is unavailable and declined. There is a need to identify the individual for EJ Coordinator position. A six-month block of funding is set aside from last year to pay for this position. A Federal IPA is the best choice for expediting the process because the person can be picked up from other agencies, as well as non-profits. A State IPA does not allow hiring of individuals from non-profits.
- An official announcement of this position must be crafted in order to ensure that we are recruiting for what we want this person to do. The job description handout is not a recruitment piece. There is no close date or target date but we do want to move quickly. The EJ Subcommittee Co-Chairs agreed to write the EJ Coordinator Position Announcement (see Action Items Chart p. 8).
- The May revise of the CALFED Program budget will be available for public review on May 14, 2002. Wendy Halverson Martin recommended that the EJ Subcommittee think about how the estimated \$250,000 allocated to EJ will be used. Because the budget is not done, it is important to have a voice to ensure that EJ continues to be funded. The EJ Subcommittee asked when the real dollar amount for EJ would be known. Wendy responded that reconciliation between different groups should be settled by July 1<sup>st</sup>, however there will be a lot of negotiation to be done.
- The good news is that there is a water bond on the November ballot, and this is definitely a mechanism for bringing more money to CALFED. Senator Feinstein's bill as well as Senators Tauscher and Napolitano's bill have the potential to stimulate activity on the Federal side. CALFED will be a decisive issue between the

candidates. Because water has continued to be a priority, CALFED has at least the current level of support.

- The EJ Subcommittee discussed other potential funding sources to help achieve the common goal. The EPA's Office of Environmental Justice has funding available that the EJ Subcommittee might be eligible to receive. Dan Wermiel accepted the action item to ask EPA to come to a Subcommittee meeting and give an overview of their program (see Action Items Chart p. 8). Ideas for the discussion included identifying how EPA sets priorities, what process they use for evaluating proposals for funding, and the possibility for integration of the programs.
- The group also identified the California Biodiversity Council as an agency with natural resource management responsibility; the Council has an upcoming meeting with an EJ theme. The group discussed the need to identify if there is an opportunity for synergy, to build and network amongst existing programs. Co-Chairs of the EJ Subcommittee agreed to attend the meeting (see Action Items Chart p. 8).
- The EJ Subcommittee discussed their role as a leader in the integration of EJ into government agencies. The Governor's Office of Planning & Research is one of a core group of agencies developing a plan to address EJ issues. Training sessions may be a good forum for offering assistance to agencies in the initial stages.
- The group also addressed the importance of incorporating EJ into official CEQA regulations. Working closely with Cal EPA introduces an opportunity to push for a standard process for EJ review within CEQA. We want to position EJ so that the next time Cal EPA revises CEQA regulations we can influence inclusion of EJ. The group also discussed that it would be interesting to have a conversation with Cal EPA regarding the planning phase of SB115 and potential overlap with CALFED.

### **Summary of Strategies for Integration with CALFED Program Elements**

- Incorporate criteria in PSPs that encourage improving communities as well as meeting CALFED goals
- Provide technical assistance to organizations to do good proposals
- PSP "set asides" for furthering EJ goals
- Use schools for information transfer
- Request Steering Committee to meet on EJ and/or integration of CALFED activities and programs
- Encourage project proponents to partner with community-based organizations
- Dealing with limited resources: find a forcing function and coordinate PSP outreach

### **Next Steps**

- Subcommittee Chairs of Water Use Efficiency and EJ should meet
- Water Use Efficiency – include CALFED agencies, Dept. of Water Resources and Bureau of Reclamation in plan to incorporate EJ and integrate

- Carving out EJ funding in PSP budget
- Include technical assistance in PSP
- Add EJ members to Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee
- Report to EJ Subcommittee on past grants and EJ benefits for background for setting %s and technical assistance
- EJ Subcommittee to develop criteria or guidance for incorporating EJ actions into PSPs
- Distribute Prop. 13 list of economically, disadvantaged communities to start identifying target community database
- Coordinate local outreach to cover several CALFED Program PSPs
- Potential for the EJ Subcommittee to attend traveling meetings, joint with other Subcommittees
- Coordinate with local organizations
- Check in with other State, Federal and local government for lessons learned
- Look at Colorado River planning process for examples/lessons learned on EJ outreach and activities
- Use a project or activity to highlight EJ as a “case study”
- Concept proposals – focus comments on how local communities can meet EJ objectives and incorporate in full proposal and potential to have EJ panel member.
- EJ Subcommittee identify contracting and other barriers, such as cash flow issues with community based organizations’ capacity building to maintain sustainable programs

### **Resource Issues and Priority Tasks for Subcommittee**

#### **Handouts: Dan Wermiel’s and Torri Estrada’s Draft EJ Budgets**

- The group decided that the goal of analyzing the budget would be to prioritize and to determine tasks with specified dollar amounts with the objective of identifying a set of strategies, timeline, lead agency, staff, budget and resource applications.
- The group decided to work off of Torri’s table to look at numbers and begin to prioritize. It was also decided that the group would try to designate dollar amounts instead of FTE so as not to confuse in CALFED terms. The suggestion was made that because Federal and State money comes in phases, that resources should be spent with those schedules in mind.
- The group agreed on Objective 1 of Torri’s table, to hire an EJ Coordinator. The group discussed how much this individual would cost, including benefits, and decided it would cost approximately \$120,000 to hire this person. Support for EJ Subcommittee and the revising of the work plan was designated also included in Objective 1. Although the group discussed that these might be two different actions.
- Road shows were also discussed as a part of Objective 1; the group discussed how many would be appropriate and feasible. The group considered that there are 5 regions in CALFED however, 5 road shows would be too many. The group decided the 3 road shows would be feasible, with the possibility of adding a fourth. The

group also revisited the idea of teaming up with other CALFED programs to leverage resources and to further the goal of integration. The group decided that consultation with the different groups would be necessary to determine if they would be open to joint meetings.

- Also as part of Objective 1, the group discussed the need to hire a facilitator that could help the group make progress on the work plan and “to develop and integrate environmental goals, objectives, strategies and performance measures across CALFED’s programs.” There was mixed feelings in the group whether a facilitator would be necessary and whether resources should be used to hire this person.
- The group determined that an additional column should be added to Torri’s table to show specific amounts of money spent from the EJ Subcommittee budget. The column with hours for current participants in the EJ Subcommittee and incurred costs covered by outside resources should remain on the table as a heads up to people to know how much time they should allot for EJ activities.
- Objective 2 of Torri’s table, “Develop annual work plans for the EJ Subcommittee (and EJ Coordinator) to assist programs with implementation of program-wide goals, objectives, strategies and performance measures,” was agreed upon by the group. The group decided that program evaluation would be an integral strategy for implementing EJ in CALFED and for the overall sustainability of all CALFED programs. The group determined that help from the science program might be necessary to determine metrics and provide technical assistance.
- Objective 3 of Torri’s table came directly from page 2 of the annual plan. Each program covers its own public outreach so it is imperative that there is a system to identify EJ communities, develop a proactive outreach strategy and ensure that it is implemented effectively. The group determined that it would be the EJ Coordinator’s role to take the lead on these actions. The group also discussed that if EJ is to be integrated into other CALFED programs that the other programs should be required to report back on their EJ outreach. It was suggested that the EJ program could offer training to these groups on how to outreach to EJ communities. EPA was identified as an agency that could provide guidance on how to do these training sessions. Dan accepted the action item to contact EPA to find out if they could provide a presentation on outreach methods to the Subcommittee (see Action Items Chart p. 8).
- The group agreed on Objective 4 of Torri’s table, “Develop and implement a CALFED program-wide environmental justice education and technical skills program.” The group determined that crafting the EJ Coordinator Position Announcement to reflect this objective and the overall work plan would be the first step to ensuring the recruitment of an individual capable of envisioning the education and technical program. Objective 4c, “to implement a tailored training program to provide needed education and technical assistance to CALFED programs and staff” was designated as an action for next year. The group considered that when the “how” is identified, then the “what” and “why” can be addressed.

- Objective 5, “Develop tools and capacity of CALFED agencies and staff to identify, avoid/mitigate, and evaluate EJ issues” spurred a discussion on the role of the EJ Coordinator. The group discussed that data analysis using GIS mapping and ARC View would be necessary to collect demographic and environmental information and whether the EJ Coordinator would be responsible for collecting the data and providing analysis. The group determined that using existing information would be less expensive and asked meeting participant Naomi Mabins, from the CALFED Science Program, to report back on how much it would cost to do GIS mapping for objectives 5a and 5b (see Action Items Chart p. 8). The group decided EPA would be an appropriate resource to determine cost of implementing objective 5c and 5d and whether it would have to come out of the Subcommittee budget.
  
- The Subcommittee briefly discussed the possibility of hiring an outside consultant to perform the duties of the EJ Coordinator. The benefit of a consultant would be that they would have previous experience with this kind of work. The drawbacks to hiring a consultant included cost and the perpetuation of the distinction of EJ as different from other CALFED programs. The group agreed that a consultant could ultimately have a role in the process, however there are restrictions in funding.
  
- The group reiterated the need to communicate with organizations identified as potential teaming partners. Norman Calero is a direct line to the EPA, as well as Rod Johnson.
  
- Dan agreed to incorporate the changes discussed at the meeting into Torri’s budget table (see Action Items Chart p. 8).
  
- The next EJ Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2002, 10 a.m. – 3 p.m. in the Bonderson Building Board Room. EJ Subcommittee meetings are generally scheduled for the second Friday of the month. The featured CALFED programs for next month’s meeting will be the Ecosystem Restoration Program and the Drinking Water Quality Program.

**Final action items discussed:**

- Follow up on coordination with Watershed Program
- Follow up on contracting issues with grants
- Development of outreach database
- Identify the EJ Coordinator and consideration of potential candidates in other agencies

### Action Items Chart

<b>Meeting Participant</b>	<b>Action Item</b>
Martha Guzman, Co-Chair	To contact Gary Bobker to hold an Environmental Justice meeting with the BDPAC
EJ Subcommittee Co-Chairs	To set up a meeting with the Co-Chairs of the Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee
EJ Subcommittee Co-Chairs	To write the EJ Coordinator Position Announcement
Dan Wermiel, Acting EJ Coordinator	To ask EPA to come to a Subcommittee meeting and give an overview of their EJ Program
EJ Subcommittee Co-Chairs	To attend the California Biodiversity Council meeting
Naomi Mabins, CALFED Science Program	To report back on how much it would cost to do GIS mapping for objectives 5a and 5b
Dan Wermiel, Acting EJ Coordinator	To incorporate the changes discussed at the meeting into Torri's budget table

# BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE

## Meeting Summary

---

**Meeting Date/Location:** Friday, March 15, 2002  
Los Angeles River Center and Gardens – Atrium  
570 West Avenue Twenty-six, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA

---

### Welcome and Introductions

Robert Meacher and Martha Davis, Watershed Subcommittee Co-chairs, began the meeting with a welcome and round of introductions of all meeting participants (see Attachment A). Martha Davis explained that the intent of holding a Subcommittee meeting in southern California is to:

- Provide a forum for exchange of information
- Enable southern California projects to demonstrate their successes and the overall benefits to the CALFED program
- Allow CALFED staff to update southern California on CALFED activities

### Overview of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program

Patrick Wright, Executive Director of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED) provided an overview of CALFED. Mr. Wright explained that CALFED was established to address water management and ecological health issues in the Bay-Delta. This year Senator Costa introduced a governance bill that will provide a framework for the roles and responsibilities of the 20 to 25 member agencies of CALFED and outline contracting guidelines that will ultimately streamline the implementation of the Program.

Mr. Wright explained that implementation of CALFED was originally envisioned as specific state and federal agencies eventually bearing the responsibility of implementing programs once developed. However, as CALFED evolved, the focus of that strategy shifted toward the facilitation and coordination of grass roots and other local efforts in order to optimize their value while meeting CALFED goals and objectives.

Mr. Wright described the state and federal funding vehicles under which CALFED has been operating. State general fund money has recently decreased but Proposition 204 and Proposition 13 have enabled CALFED to spend \$500,000,000 on projects. Proposition 40, the water bond initiative, is a potential source of funds in the future. Mr. Wright stated that CALFED agencies

foresee the use of general fund and bond monies to fill some of the funding gaps in the Program; however, there may be a funding increase in some CALFED programs and a decrease in others (such as water conservation grants and watershed). CALFED's future funding will come from several sources, including Proposition 13 and 40, state general funds, nonpoint source funds and others. Mr. Wright explained that all of these sources have different focal points but are dedicated to watershed management. Given the condition of the state budget, it will be a challenge to manage funds in a manner that will continue to support projects throughout the state while ultimately reaching the goals and objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Mr. Wright pointed out that there has been an approximate 100-person reduction in staff throughout the CALFED member agencies. As a result, CALFED has to rely more heavily on existing workgroups. Mr. Wright noted that the Watershed Subcommittee could serve as a model due to its unique efforts that have essentially moved the Watershed Program forward.

Maria Rea, California Resources Agency, explained that the Resources Agency was conducting a study of watershed groups throughout the state. A questionnaire within the study requested feedback on the benefits and weaknesses of existing programs and requested suggestions for revising the programs to better support local watershed activities. Ms. Rea stated that a primary comment was there are too many programs with differing requirements. As a result, many groups spend a great deal of time writing grant applications and altering projects to fit specific grant requirements. Ms. Rea noted that the funding flexibility within Proposition 40 presents a good opportunity to begin implementing changes in response to those comments. Ms. Rea stated that the Resources Agency would welcome additional feedback on how to strengthen its programs throughout California.

## **Overview of the CALFED Watershed Program**

John Lowrie, CALFED Watershed Program (Watershed Program) Manager provided an overview of the Watershed Program. Mr. Lowrie explained that the focus of the watershed program is to promote and build local partnerships. The intent is that these partnerships will produce positive results on a broad regional scale. Mr. Lowrie explained the four primary objectives of CALFED are to provide good quality water, improve habitat, improve water supply reliability, and reduce levee breaches. To that end, the Watershed Program employs two categories of tools to reach those goals: (1) technical assistance from member agencies and (2) financial assistance to promote collaboration and integration of local efforts. Mr. Lowrie noted that additional positions within state agencies have been authorized to support the Watershed Program but with the current hiring freeze those positions cannot be filled.

Mr. Lowrie noted that the geographic scope of the Watershed Program is broad, including watersheds that flow to or receive water from the Bay-Delta. The Watershed Program strategy for the first 3 years of a 7-year long Phase I Implementation is to better define the relationships between watershed processes and to demonstrate the value of using community-based approaches.

Mr. Lowrie stated that the Watershed Program has been successful in coordinating efforts of community-based programs. Last year, the Watershed Program implemented a proposal

solicitation process that funded 54 projects totaling more than \$18 million. Mr. Lowrie added that it was encouraging to see the success of community-based efforts in securing matching funds and in expanding capacity building efforts.

## **Panel: Capacity Building in Southern California**

### ***Los Angeles & San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council***

Rick Harter provided some history and background on the Watershed Council. The Council, which celebrated its 5-year anniversary last summer, was formed to provide a forum in which to share perspectives and network. The primary areas of focus for the Council are mediation, education, planning, and acting as a “broker” of activities conducted by various groups. Mr. Harter stated that the brokering essentially serves as a capacity-building function. The first 4.5 years of activities were organized primarily by Dorothy Green and performed on a volunteer basis. Shortly after that, Mr. Harter was hired to serve as executive director. Mr. Harter stated that the Council outlined the activities that it supports in a grant application submitted to the Watershed Program. A grant was subsequently received, enabling the Council to further its activities through the hire of a staff scientist with experience in geographic information systems. Mr. Harter added that the Watershed Program grant also enables the Council to educate other community-based programs on the Watershed Program goals and objectives. The Council has been the recipient of an Organization Development Grant, a project-related grant, and a Watershed Partnership Seminar grant.

### ***Orange County Watershed Program***

Michael Wellborn introduced the audience to the Orange County Watershed Program. Mr. Wellborn indicated that there are 13 watersheds in Orange County. Awareness of the need to take action at a watershed level peaked when people began to express concern with the health of the area beaches. Watershed activities were set in motion with a series of meetings with Orange County and other local government officials to discuss issues such as flooding and creek instability.

Mr. Wellborn stated that funding was requested and received from the Corps of Engineers to implement short, mid and long-term solutions. Short-term solutions involved activities related to urban runoff, water quality, and urban use of water; especially the efficient use of home irrigation. The mid-term activities involved complex issues related to infrastructure damaged during flooding events including roads, bridges, parks, etc. The long-term activities related to how future regulation/policies could be updated to include development practices, building standards, fire, greenway and other needs to avoid similar problems occurring in the future. Mr. Wellborn explained that the Orange County Watershed Program goals include increasing public awareness of watershed level issues and activities, supporting local ordinances that will effect positive change, and stabilization of streams.

### ***Friends of the San Gabriel River***

Jacqueline Lambrechts explained that Friends of the San Gabriel River (FSGR) is dedicated to the restoration and protection of the San Gabriel River and its tributaries. Ms. Lambrechts

provided some details on the San Gabriel River. The river has 3 dams located within the Angeles National Forest. Portions of the river have been engineered and straightened and others are encased in concrete. The San Gabriel River is one of the most productive trout streams in southern California. In the fall of 2000, water was diverted from the concrete lined portion of the river because it was believed that fish could not survive in the concrete-lined section. Many fish were found lying dead on the concrete lining.

Ms. Lambrechts explained that the latest activities of the FSGR include conducting water quality workshops, providing testimony at community meetings, and hosting a reception for the Secretary of the Resources Agency, Mary Nichols. Most recently, the Watershed Program provided grant funds to establish a citizen water quality-monitoring program. Outreach efforts have been coordinated to promote the program and secure volunteers. FSGR has also coordinated with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to assist in developing TMDLs for the San Gabriel River. Ms. Lambrechts stated that coordination is also ongoing with Orange County its in implementation of the Coyote Creek subwatershed plan through integration of citizen monitoring efforts.

### ***San Diego Watershed Connections***

Suzanne Michaels provided some background on San Diego Watershed Connections. She stated that the research approach for this project was unique in that it involved social scientists evaluating impacts on the environment. The research approach was broad and included interviews with scientists, engineers and landowners. The outcome of the study indicated two primary problem areas in San Diego; water quality and wetland destruction. Ms. Michaels stated that in San Diego there are beach closures, urban expansion, and 3,000 miles of sewage infrastructure. She posed the question: How do you obtain good water if you are economically disadvantaged? If you are wealthy, water can be imported from elsewhere. If you are not wealthy, you are unable to obtain good water. Poor water quality impacts are felt in both the human population as well as the ecological population. Ms. Michaels stated that the second problem area is wetland destruction. Wetlands are being filled as a result of urban expansion; leaving fewer and fewer wetlands while increasing a sense that wetlands should be protected and untouched. As a result, wetlands are preserved and fenced to prohibit access. Prohibiting access does not stimulate stewardship or provide recreational value. Therefore, the intent to protect can often have an opposite and unintended negative result.

Ms. Michaels explained that a geographic approach to environmental impacts provides a fresh view to solving environmental problems. She noted that local efforts can provide great benefit, but without a regional understanding of watershed issues, the benefits are not as great. Ms. Michael added that the Colorado River Delta is an excellent example of the need for binational cooperation between Mexico and the United States to address regional, large scale watershed issues. In order to understand human impacts, you must understand the culture and history of the people of the watershed.

In San Diego, Ms. Michaels stated that San Diego River Connections is pushing for integration of watershed activities. Current planning activities that may be integrated include habitat conservation, watershed planning, and smart growth.

## **Panel: Watershed Projects: Making Connections to the Bay-Delta System**

### ***Water Efficiency in Chino Basin***

Martha Davis, Inland Empires Utility Agency (IEUA), discussed water efficiency planning in the Chino Basin. She explained that the Chino Basin, part of the Santa Ana Watershed, is approximately 242 square miles in size with 5.7 million acre-feet of storage. By the year 2020, the population of the Chino Basin is expected to nearly double from 700,000 to 1.2 million. Ms. Davis noted that 30 percent of southern California's water supply is imported; 99 percent of which comes from the Bay-Delta via the State Water Project. Ms. Davis stated that the need to work cooperatively within the Chino Basin to take advantage of unused storage capacity and improve water quality was not long ago realized. With funding received from CALFED, a Storm Water Workshop was held in July 2001. This workshop brought several stakeholders together to examine storm water recharge opportunities. Currently there is approximately 50,000 acre feet of storm water runoff; 7,500 acre-feet is captured, 23,000 acre feet of could be captured in recharge basins and an additional 10,000 – 20,000 acre-feet could be captured through on-site recharge. Ms. Davis explained that implementing recharge activities would increase and protect the yield of the Chino basin, maximize recharge of recycled water, and provide stored water that will reduce pressure on the San Francisco Bay-Delta supplies.

Ms. Davis discussed the local benefits of storm water recharge including a reduction in flooding, improvement of water quality, enhancement of recreational opportunities and restoration of the natural hydrology to support habitat. Ms. Davis indicated that next steps in the Chino Basin storm water programs consist of the development of education/and outreach campaign, a water resources guide and website, and demonstration projects such as the IEUA Administrative Headquarters. Ms. Davis noted the IEUA Headquarters incorporates energy efficient and environmentally sound materials with recycled products throughout the interior and exterior (tiles and carpet, parking lot, gardens). The landscaping incorporates drought tolerant gardens with native species supported by recycled water as well as a storm water capture demonstration area.

### ***Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and Tree People***

Vik Bapna introduced the Sun Valley Watershed Project. The Sun Valley watershed is a pilot watershed management project by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works in partnership with Tree People. He explained that the Sun Valley watershed is 4.4 square miles and is a tributary to the Los Angeles River. The watershed is highly urbanized with active gravel mines and landfills, numerous auto dismantling operations and other commercial and industrial operations. Chronic flooding has increased awareness of the need for a watershed planning approach. Mr. Bapna mentioned that the Sun Valley Watershed Stakeholder Group was convened to explore sustainable solutions to flooding problems outside of traditional methods (i.e., storm drains and other infrastructure). The mission of the group is to “solve the local flooding problem while retaining all storm water runoff from the watershed, increasing water conservation, recreational opportunities, and wildlife habitat, and reducing storm water pollution.” Most notably, the group is comprised of 65 participants representing state agencies, local municipalities, private landowners and community groups. With program implementation,

it is estimated that approximately 3,200 acre feet of storm water per year could be captured for reuse and groundwater recharge. Mr. Bapna indicated that the program links to the Bay-Delta in that it will ultimately reduce reliance upon Bay-Delta water. He noted that as a pilot project, the Sun Valley Watershed Management Project could be replicated throughout the Southern California, amplifying the positive effects to the Bay-Delta Region. Mr. Bapna then introduced Rebecca Drayse, with Tree People who is managing the public outreach portion of the Sun Valley project.

Rebecca Drayse described the public outreach activities being conducted for the Sun Valley project. To begin the outreach efforts, a baseline literary poll was conducted in the watershed. The poll posed questions relating to where domestic water comes from and sought to determine literary levels with respect to environmental terminology used in watershed activities. Ms. Drayse indicated that ongoing and future outreach activities would include quarterly newsletters (printed in English and Spanish), educational brochures, engaging community leaders in activities, tables at community events, school education programs, and media events. Ms. Drayse stated that all of these activities are intended to promote awareness of the issues in the Sun Valley Watershed and build capacity within the community. The results of public outreach activities were recently realized at Broadus Elementary School where a Green Team of students and faculty participated in the design and implementation of a storm water infiltration system beneath a playing field.

### *Northeast Trees*

Eileen Takata provided some information on the Arroyo Seco Watershed Management Plan and Education Program that Northeast Trees is developing with Watershed Program grant funds. She stated that the goals of the program are to restore the natural hydrological functioning of the watershed, including stream restoration; better manage, optimize, and conserve water resources and improve water quality; improve habitat quality, quantity and connectivity; improve recreational opportunities; foster long-term agency and organizational support; and education and involve the public in watershed stewardship.

Ms. Takata mentioned that the Watershed Program grant enabled planning and studies to be conducted. Information was gathered related to water input and output, where water is stored, used and how it can be conserved. She noted that these activities have resulted in recommendations for watershed actions that have been outlined in a Phase II Summary report soon to be released. Northeast Trees is also conducting education and outreach programs by means of a website, workshops, and various presentations and education materials. Ms. Takata noted that as a result of the success of the program, other funding opportunities and grants have become available.

### *Latino Issues Forum/EJ Coalition on Water and BUHP Advocates*

Torri Estrada discussed environmental justice and efforts to encourage low-income communities to initiate watershed programs. He explained that there are 17 principles of environmental justice. The first principle is that people and communities have the right to equal environmental protection under the law and to live, work, and play in communities that are safe,

healthy, and free of life-threatening conditions. In California, there are a disproportionate number of water-quality impaired and ecologically degraded aquatic systems in communities of color (land use, watershed, and community health nexus). In addition, these communities are often lacking access to and the benefit from public expenditures and funding for water as well as programs to address community water problems and environmental justice issues.

Mr. Estrada stated that the Environmental Justice Coalition was formed in 1999 in response to CALFED and the lack of meaningful participation of people of color and low-income communities. The Coalition serves to link locally focused environmental justice efforts on water to state-level policymaking and management. The intent of the EJ Coalition on water is to expand and build upon the public rights related to water by facilitating broader participation of people of color in local and statewide water policy and planning. In addition, it intends to facilitate collaboration among environmental justice, rural, ethnic, farm workers, and environmental communities.

Mr. Estrada noted that there are community-based activities in low-income communities, such as the Mothers of East LA and other Los Angeles community-based organizations, that support low-flow toilet retrofit programs that provide huge water savings in Los Angeles. In the San Francisco Bay Area, the Bay-View Hunters Point restoration of Yosemite Creek presents an opportunity to engage high school students in water quality sampling and wildlife habitat assessment while meeting CALFED goals. Mr. Estrada indicated that in order to implement such activities, low-income communities need funding, technical assistance, cooperative agency partners, user-friendly programs with flexible timelines, and access to resources. Historically, low-income communities of color have not had access to federal and state funding. In addition, matching requirements for funding can often pose an undue burden in already economically disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Estrada pointed out that in response to the need to address environmental justice, CALFED has agreed to integrate environmental justice across CALFED programs. He stated that CALFED has included environmental justice issues in its priority actions, including support of environmental justice representatives on CALFED advisory committees and subcommittees. These efforts will result in an increase in capacity to conduct meaningful outreach and participation in decision-making in the Bay-Delta.

### **Next Steps in Building Partnerships: CALFED Bay-Delta Program and Southern California Watershed Interests**

Patrick Wright encouraged the participants to educate their legislative representatives of the importance of watershed management projects such as those presented. He commented that it is much more effective for representatives to hear about watershed management benefits from the people in the watersheds than from agency representatives. To optimize the benefits that may be derived from Proposition 40 funding, Mr. Wright encouraged the participants to convey their ideas as to the types of projects Proposition 40 should fund and the manner in which funds are dispersed.

### ***Discussion***

A meeting participant commented that the competitive grant process worked well in spreading monies across the state. However, watershed coordinators are often needed to write grant applications. In light of the fact that bond monies are earmarked for capital projects, the ability to fund coordinators is often ruled out. Funds need to be specifically allocated to watershed coordinators.

Another participant noted that the competitive grant process works well; however, the limitations and requirements can be cumbersome and often force applicants to redesign their projects to fit individual funding requirements. In addition, the application process can be expensive and time-consuming, often eliminating low-income communities.

One participant noted the need for a prioritization system. For example, there are several watershed coordinators who have gained valuable experience over the last two years who will no longer have funding after June 2002. Without a priority to continue that funding beyond June, these folks will likely find new jobs and the watersheds will lose their experience.

A participant suggested a multi-group application requirement that would call for coordination with partners. Those partners could include resource agencies, municipalities, and local watershed groups.

### **Wrap-up and De-brief of Meeting**

Martha Davis and Robert Meacher asked the participants to provide their comments on the meeting. Suggestions noted were to incorporate longer breaks that would provide an opportunity to network amongst attendees, and having break out groups with technical experts to enable information exchange.

Ms. Davis and Mr. Meacher thanked the participants for attending and the meeting was adjourned.

*Attachment A*

**MEETING PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Adulson, Mark	Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
Bapna, Vik	LA County Department of Public Works
Beck, Michael	Endangered Habitats League
Berg, Joe	Metropolitan Water District of Orange County
Bullard, Kathleen	Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
Bundy, Summer	Department of Water Resources
Catalano, Jeff	City of Los Angeles
Chapman, Trish	Coastal Conservancy
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Czamanske, Davis	Sierra Club
Davis, Martha	Inland Empire Utilities Agency/BDPAC
Delgado, Doug	Calvine Abe Associates
Derivi, Tanya	Los Angeles Department of Water
Donovan, Jim	NPS Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program
Drayse, Rebecca	TreePeople
Drill, Sabrina	UC Cooperative Extension
Estrada, Torri	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Everts, Conner	Southern California Watershed Alliance
Flores, Macaria	LA Regional Water Quality Control Board
Frances, Tom	Ballona Wetlands Land Trust
Fox, Dennis	Kelliv Lake Coordinated Resource Management Program
Golding, Arthur	Arthur Golding & Associates
Green, Dorothy	Los Angeles & San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council
Harter, Rick	Los Angeles & San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council
Haze, Steve	Millerton Area Watershed Coalition
Hazzard, Michael	Meeting Participant
Henderson, Brad	Department of Fish and Game
Horne, Mark	EIP Associates
Hoyos, Renee	California Resources Agency
Hranilovich, Jennifer	The Trust for Public Land
Jacobs, Selene	Jones & Stokes
Johnson, Melissa Cole	RCD SMA
Kampe, Lynnette	North East Trees
Kennedy, Francine	City of San Juan Capistrano
Kesinger, Kit	Ramona MWD & Iron Mountain Conservancy
Labahn, Ed	Dana Point resident
Lambrichts, Jacqueline	Friends of San Gabriel River
Lamm, Jim	Ballona Creek Renaissance and Watershed Task Force

Lessick, Dale	Irvine Ranch Water District/private citizen
Lowrie, John	CALFED
Lund, Leval	CE
Matson, Tanya	Jones & Stokes
Matsuyama, Kathie	Orange County/ Watersheds Division
May, Don	California Earth Corps
Meacher, Robert	Regional Council for Rural Counties/BDPAC
Mead, Aaron	Philip Williams & Associates
Miranda, Salomon	Department of Water Resources
Ngugi, Nancy	LA Regional Water Quality Control Board
Ohare, Debra	Mountains Restoration Trust
Olgin, Nami	Altadena Foothills Conservancy
Padzik, Helene	Iron Mountain Conservancy
Reed, Rhonda	Department of Fish and Game/AFRP
Rierdan, Robert	San Diego River Park Lakeside Conservancy
Rose, Kathy	Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
Segawa, Cheryl	City of San Diego
Scotto, Hazel	League of Women Voters
Shapin, Nim	Ballona Creek Watershed Task Force
Smith, Lynda	Metropolitan Water District
Spiny-Well, Frances	Mono Lake Committee
Stewart, Peggy	Arroyo Seco Fd
Swearingen, Jeanne	Riverview Water District
Takata, Eileen	North East Trees
Thomas, Rick	San Gabriel Mountain Regional Conservancy
Thum, Alan	San Eliso Lagoon Conservancy
Webb, Olin	BUHP Community Advocates
Wellborn, Mike	County of Orange
Wermiel, Dan	CALFED
Weschler, Peter	Environmental Water Caucus
Ziegler, Sam	USEPA

*Attachment B*

**MEETING MATERIALS**

- CALFED Bay-Delta Program Watershed Program Plan
  - Meeting Agenda
  - February 15, 2002, BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee Meeting Summary
-

# **BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE**

## **Meeting Summary**

---

**Meeting Date/Location:** Friday, April 19, 2002  
10:00 AM to 3:00 PM  
Jones & Stokes  
2600 V Street  
Sacramento, CA

---

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Robert Meacher, Watershed Subcommittee Co-chair, began the meeting with a welcome and round of introductions of all meeting participants (see Attachment A).

### **Debrief of the 3/15/02 Los Angeles Road Show Meeting**

Mr. Meacher stated that the March Road Show meeting in Los Angeles was extremely successful. There was much positive feedback received from participants. The City of Los Angeles, and San Diego and Orange Counties were among those present. The meeting provided excellent opportunities for information exchange, and participants appreciated the chance to communicate with Patrick Wright, Executive Director of CALFED.

John Lowrie (CALFED Watershed Program Manager) explained that there has been discussion about using the Watershed Subcommittee as a vehicle for providing greater outreach and information. The Los Angeles Road Show meeting was a tremendous success. An objective of the meeting was to invite organizations that had received CALFED Watershed Program funding to describe their projects and desired outcomes, and how those projects relate to the objectives of the Watershed Program and Bay-Delta system. The meeting included 5 outstanding presentations by grantees. Another Watershed Program objective for the meeting was to connect with new partners. The meeting provided an opportunity for representatives from northern and southern California to share and inform.

Sam Ziegler (U.S. EPA) described how the meeting addressed 2 key issues: (1) the benefits of upstate water conservation and (2) the need to provide and sustain long-term funding for watershed efforts. Ken Coulter (SWRCB) added that the meeting generated energetic, enthusiastic, creative participation by local watershed groups. Mr. Lowrie stated that the next Road Show meeting will be a tour to Cache Creek on May 17. Martha Davis (Watershed Subcommittee Co-chair) will be present.

## **Setting Priorities and Developing Measures of Success for the BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee**

John Lowrie provided an overview of the 2002 BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee Workplan. He indicated that this agenda item is a continuation of a discussion held 2 months ago at the February Subcommittee meeting. This brainstorming session was in response to the BDPAC's requirement that the Watershed Subcommittee identify priority activities for the next year and report back on whether goals and objectives have been achieved. The conversation from the February meeting was summarized in a handout that lists 7 Goals and 7 Measures for Success for 2002. The Draft Measures of Success listed on the handout were proposed by Watershed Program staff, and not generated during the February brainstorming session. Mr. Lowrie indicated that Goal and Measure #7, which relate to funding the Watershed Program, are considered the most important issues to address. The Watershed Program is therefore seeking input and ideas from the Subcommittee on this and all elements of the Workplan. The Workplan is summarized below:

### **Goals for 2002:**

1. Advise and support implementation of the current annual grant program.
2. Adopt initial set of Program level performance measurements and begin tracking performance of program.
3. Conduct public outreach through the Watershed Subcommittee.
4. Implement key elements of the Watershed Program Memorandum of Understanding.
5. Work toward integration of purpose and effort with other CALFED Program elements and the Environmental Justice Subcommittee.
6. Develop an annual implementation plan, including priorities, key activities, milestones, and schedules. These will be linked to current fund availability, both source and amount.
7. Continue to address and develop funding strategies for the CALFED Watershed Program.

### **Measures of Success for the Year End:**

1. Successful completion of current RFP process on schedule
  - package of projects funded meets criteria identified in "initial implementation strategy."
2. Initial set of Program level performance measures adopted for use by August 31, 2002.
3. Schedule and conduct 4 road show meetings of the Watershed Subcommittee
  - 100 new participants engaged through road show meetings.
4. Complete execution of MOU by all cooperating agencies and departments
  - Management team operational, day to day responsibilities carried out on schedule
  - Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT) actively involved in development of implementation plan
  - IWAT fully integrated with Watershed Subcommittee.
5. One joint meeting of Watershed, Drinking Water, Water Use Efficiency, and Environmental Justice Subcommittees
  - Draft a shared set of Program integration principles.
6. Implementation Plan developed and adopted by responsible agencies and Watershed Subcommittee by August 31, 2002.

7. Adequate funding for implementation of the Program in years 3 and 4 secured.

One participant asked how Subcommittee integration per Measure #5 will be achieved. Mr. Lowrie responded that there has been interest expressed among BDPAC Subcommittee chairpersons to integrate efforts. He stated that Watershed Program staff feels it is appropriate for the Watershed Program to provide a link for integration among CALFED Program elements. The Watershed is the right context for natural resource management activities, and the community is the appropriate forum. Mr. Lowrie suggested that he invite other program representatives to speak to the Watershed Subcommittee at a future meeting. Mr. Meacher commented that the new U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service director for California has stated that watershed management needs to evolve to a level where communities are considered not just stakeholders, but partners. A participant commented that the ERP is developing regional implementation plans at the same time the CALFED Bay-Delta Program as a whole is doing the same, and that this is an example of parallel tracking versus integrated tracking.

One participant asked whether Goal #5 includes integration with the ERP. Mr. Lowrie responded that the ERP is the most difficult element to integrate but that the measurement will be changed to reflect all program elements. Another participant suggested adding a goal that refers to continued consideration of watershed restoration policies. Mr. Lowrie asked how success would be measured if goals focus on policy development. Another participant suggested adding the goal of MOU implementation progress review to goal #4. One participant proposed adding a fourth bullet to Measure #4 that states: "Review progress by Watershed Subcommittee." Another participant suggested adding a goal that links the Watershed Subcommittee work to California Biodiversity Council efforts.

Eugenia Laychek (BDPAC) suggested that 2002 Workplan Goals and Measures 2, 6, and 7 (above) be submitted as recommendations to the BDPAC by the Watershed Subcommittee. The next BDPAC meeting is scheduled for June 26–27. It will focus on Delta, watershed, levees, environmental justice, and restoration issues.

Mr. Lowrie indicated that if participants are accepting of the Workplan in general, staff will move forward with it.

Dennis Bowker (CALFED Watershed Program) provided an overview of the companion handout summarizing draft Watershed Program performance indicators and measurements (see Attachment B). He explained that the indicators and measurements format is based on that required by the CALFED Science Program, which includes an indicator, metric for indicator, objective, desired outcome, and justification. The outcomes in the indicators and measurements summary have been written to reflect the outcomes of the CALFED Watershed Program Plan.

Mr. Lowrie stated that there are different timeframes that apply to different indicators and metrics; some require shorter timeframes than others. Some timeframes may actually be longer than the Implementation Plan timeframe itself.

A participant asked whether social scientists are participating in measuring Program progress.

Mr. Bowker answered that the Public Policy Institute of California and Great Valley Center will advise on methods for measurement. Other groups are welcome to assist.

Mr. Bowker invited participants to read through the summary and provide comments on how to improve it. Mr. Lowrie indicated staff would like these indicators and measures to be adopted by the end of August 2002. He stated that staff might have to commission work to complete the summary by this deadline, which will require funding. Therefore, he would like input so the summary can be reviewed and revised at the next Subcommittee meeting before being submitted to the BDPAC.

### **CALFED Watershed Program Budget Update**

John Lowrie (CALFED Watershed Program) updated the Watershed Subcommittee on the status of the CALFED Watershed Program budget. He indicated that the State government is constitutionally required to reach agreement on the Watershed Program budget for the next fiscal year by July 1. There is a substantial budget deficit anticipated. Mr. Lowrie presented a chart illustrating the distribution of funding for various CALFED Program elements, as proposed in the Governor's 2002–2003 budget proposal. The distribution of Watershed Program funding proposed is as follows:

- \$20.6 million of Proposition 40 funds (Clean Beaches, Watershed Restoration, and Water Quality);
- \$10 million of Proposition 13 Watershed Protection Account funds (administered by the State Water Resources Control Board Fund); and
- \$4.69 million of General Fund monies.

Mr. Lowrie indicated that most of the General Fund monies are likely to vanish. He noted that the Legislative Analyst's Office has proposed reducing current general fund levels by \$43.8 million and the total CALFED Program general fund request by \$12.9 million.

Robert Meacher (RCRC) stated that \$20 million out of \$300 million of Proposition 40 funds are going toward watershed work, and it seems that one-third of the \$300 million should be designated. He suggested that the Watershed Subcommittee participants encourage their respective representatives to support the Governor's budget as currently proposed. The Subcommittee members subsequently requested a list of the participants on the Assembly Subcommittee. Mr. Lowrie indicated that he would provide the Watershed Subcommittee the list of assembly members that he had been given while attending the Assembly Subcommittee meeting.

Ken Coulter (SWRCB) noted that the funding under discussion would be available for only 1 year. Mr. Lowrie responded that long-term funding could be available through Year 7 if the Water Bond initiative is placed and passed this November.

Sam Ziegler (U.S. EPA) stated that there is currently no funding identified to support staff for grant programs. Mr. Lowrie responded that when the last budget for CALFED was appropriated at \$10 million, he believed it would establish the baseline for Program implementation funding.

That funding has now been reduced to \$4.69 million total, with an additional reduction of \$3.8 million proposed.

Mr. Lowrie stated that no Proposition 13 funds may be used for Watershed Program staff and administration costs. Laurel Ames (California Watershed Network) noted that a percentage of Proposition 40 funds should be earmarked for administration of the Watershed Program. Mr. Ziegler responded that while it is not a specific requirement, the State legislature typically avoids the use of bond funds to support staff functions.

Mr. Lowrie stated that the good news is that \$35 million is available in the Governor's budget for implementation of Watershed Program projects. This amount is \$5 million less than the amount indicated in the Record of Decision but closer to the amount indicated in the ROD than has ever been appropriated.

Another participant asked what might be the spillover effects of the current funding situation. Mr. Lowrie answered that Watershed Program staff are trying to execute 54 contracts from the 2000–2001 PSP. He noted that Program staff is hopeful that the current budget problems will not affect that process. Mr. Lowrie also mentioned that SB 23 funds are available for expenditure during a limited time. Therefore, 1 year from now those funds must be completely spent or will revert to the General Fund. He is hopeful that those funds can instead be put into a revolving fund.

Mr. Lowrie reported that the first Senate Budget Subcommittee meeting was Thursday, April 18, and that he is waiting to hear the results of that meeting. The Senate Subcommittee was reported to be planning to support the Governor's proposed budget.

A participant commented that there is inadequate federal funding support for the Watershed Program budget, and that in light of cuts to State funds, federal funds will not meet the needs of CALFED staffing.

Another participant reported that Proposition 40 is scheduled to be signed and passed by July 1, which would provide funds for the next fiscal year. It is possible that Proposition 40 funds could be used for "softer" activities such as watershed coordination.

One participant suggested that the Subcommittee contact members of the Senate Budget Subcommittees to convey their thoughts on the budget. The current situation provides an opportunity to educate Senate members on the importance of watershed activities, and Watershed Subcommittee participants may prove to be effective educators.

Another participant suggested that the budget amounts, names, and contact information for Senate Budget Subcommittee be emailed to the Watershed Subcommittee listserv.

## **Interagency Watershed Advisory Team Update**

Stefan Lorenzato and Mr. Ziegler serve as the State and federal co-chairs of the IWAT. The MOU provides for agencies to help with the Implementation Plan, local assistance, education and outreach, and Performance Measures.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the first IWAT meeting was held on March 20 and included representatives of several agencies. A framework was established and roles and responsibilities were defined at this meeting. The primary task of the IWAT is the Implementation Plan, and the IWAT will try to meet quarterly to address this challenge. Future meetings have been scheduled for June 12, 2002, November 13, 2002, and March 19, 2003. A goal of the IWAT is to strengthen its relationship with the Watershed Subcommittee. One suggestion has been to identify a subcommittee liaison who would regularly attend IWAT meetings.

The IWAT is developing a matrix to discuss areas of overlap and specifically where agencies are currently supporting watershed efforts. This matrix task includes developing a template for watershed program managers to fill out and submit. It also includes examining which programs support Watershed Program Plan goals, objectives, and outcomes and how these programs might be assisted to provide more support. Mr. Ziegler explained that the IWAT is attempting to develop a draft Implementation Plan to be approved by the Watershed Subcommittee. The IWAT is working to integrate this effort with the Performance Indicators and Measurements developed by Mr. Bowker.

## **Status of 2001–2002 Proposition 13 Request for Grant Concept Proposals**

Mr. Lowrie reported that the CALFED Watershed Program is working with the SWRCB to review and process applications to 3 different funding sources. The concept phase, also employed by the Drinking Water Quality Program, is presently coming to a close. The 103 concept applications submitted, requesting a total of \$131 million, will be assessed to determine compatibility with Watershed Program goals. These proposals have been reviewed by the Selection Review Panel, and many have been promoted to the full proposal stage. Feedback letters and assistance workshops will assist applicants in developing and submitting full proposals.

Mr. Lowrie indicated that \$10 million is available for watershed work in small, disadvantaged communities, defined as a “divisible portion of a larger community, with a population of 10,000 or less, and with proof of economic hardship.” Interestingly, proposals from the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds dominate those submitted. Most of the \$10 million must be spent on capital outlay projects. He stated that \$1 million is available to support watershed planning efforts, while \$9 million must be spent on implementation projects. Conversely, more planning project proposals (32) than implementation project proposals (22) were promoted to the full proposal stage.

A participant asked whether the Watershed Program received many applications from pre-approved small communities. Mr. Lowrie answered that few proposals were submitted by local communities. More often, the Watershed Program received proposals from watershed groups

representing small municipalities. Another participant asked whether there is coordination of projects funded by different programs. Mr. Lowrie answered that there is formal coordination with the SWRCB but not with other programs. One participant asked whether future funding will be subject to the same restrictions as this year's funding. Mr. Lowrie responded that future funding conditions are unknown at this time.

## **Watershed Legislation**

### *Watershed Education Day*

Laurel Ames (Sierra Nevada Alliance) reported on the Watershed Education Day, held in Sacramento on April 11, 2002. The focus of the day was education rather than lobbying. The effort was communicated and promoted strictly through email, web, and fax (no hard copy communication). Many participants attended, and speakers from SWRCB, the Resources Agency, and RCRC gave presentations. Organizers received much encouragement to coordinate future Education Days. Mr. Meacher attended the Education Day and indicated that others stated they would ask their representatives to attend the function next year.

### *Water Bill Updates*

- Water Bill 2070 is in suspension.
- Proponents of the Costa Bill have requested suspension in order to add language.
- The State legislature has plans to put the education and housing bills on the ballot. These bills involve greater funding than the water bonds. If the initiatives pass, passage of water bonds could become more difficult. The governor has indicated he will not sign any water bond initiatives.
- AB 2117 is complete. The bill recommends a strategic plan for State agencies. The report has been submitted to the legislature and has been distributed. It is available online at [www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov).
- AB 2806 has been revised at least 3 times. The Wayne-Dickerson bill is a work in progress. Renee Hoyos is working on this bill, which is due November 2002. Mr. Lowrie suggested it should be reviewed and critiqued by the Watershed Subcommittee. The bill involves State agencies partnering with local people to work on watershed management activities. It proposes a strategic plan to guide State agencies' future efforts to work on community watershed approaches.

## **Next BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee Meeting: Road Show in Cache Creek Watershed**

Mr. Bowker provided an overview of the proposed agenda for the May 17 Road Show in the Cache Creek Watershed. The Watershed Subcommittee will meet at the Cache Creek Nature Preserve for the business portion of the meeting. Lunch will be served at the Cache Creek Casino. The group will then tour Capay Valley and return to the preserve, where representatives of projects funded by the Watershed Program last year will give presentations.

Jan Lowrey (Cache Creek Nature Preserve) indicated that the meeting site is a 45-minute drive from downtown Sacramento. The preserve, which is 130 acres, provides education to school

groups. To help coordinate transportation, RSVPs will be requested for this meeting.

### **Watershed Updates**

- Josh Bradt (Urban Creeks Council) stated that the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water is looking for a speaker for its workshops on May 17–18. Any suggestions are welcome.
- Josh Bradt proposed holding the fall Road Show Subcommittee meeting in San Francisco at Bayview–Hunters Point. Mr. Meacher responded that the BDPAC may have a meeting in San Francisco in December, and the June Road Show is planned for the Feather River Watershed.
- Mr. Lowrie indicated that the Watershed Program is planning to host the second Watershed Partnership Seminar this fall, and invites all alumni to suggest their supervisors attend. The Program will solicit nominations for participants soon.
- The Watershed Stewardship Plan for the Mokelumne River Watershed will be released at an open house on May 23 from 2 pm to 7 pm at Hutchins Street Square in Lodi.
- Mr. Bowker stated that he is working with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to identify closed stream gages that need reopening. Any recommendations are welcome.
- Mr. Ziegler indicated that the EPA administration has a new watershed initiative.

Mr. Meacher thanked the participants for attending and the meeting was adjourned.

*Attachment A*

**MEETING PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Ames, Laurel	California Watershed Network
Bradt, Josh	Urban Creeks Council
Bratcher, Tricia	California Department of Fish and Game
Brodie, John	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Brown, Syd	Department of Parks and Recreation
Bowker, Dennis	CALFED Watershed Program/Sac River Watershed Program
Buzzard, Diane	Bureau of Reclamation
Cantrell, Scott	California Department of Fish and Game
Cornelius, James	Calaveras Water District
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Finney, Vern	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Freeman, Robin	Environmental Justice Water Coalition
Harris, Bob	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Haze, Steve	Millerton Area Watershed Coalition
Jacobs, Selene	Jones & Stokes
Lavelle, Jane	City and County of San Francisco
Laychek, Eugenia	BDPAC
Lorenzato, Stefan	California Department of Water Resources
Lowrey, Jan	Cache Creek Conservancy
Lowrie, John	CALFED Watershed Program
Matson, Tanya	Jones & Stokes
Meacher, Robert	RCRC/BDPAC
Miyamoto, Joe	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Oldland, Susan	California Department of Water Resources
Seits, Mark	TetraTech
Sime, Fraser	California Department of Water Resources
Smith, Lynda	Metropolitan Water District
Swearingen, Vieva	Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group
Taylor, Ernie	California Department of Water Resources
Thomas, Lenore	Bureau of Land Management
Voegel, Hal	Consultant
Walsh Casey	California Department of Food and Agriculture
Ward, Kevin	ICE, UC Davis
Wermiel, Dan	CALFED
Ziegler, Sam	USEPA

**MEETING MATERIALS**

- Meeting Agenda
  - March 15, 2002, BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee Meeting Summary
  - Subcommittee for Watershed Management BDPAC 2002 Draft Workplan
  - CALFED Watershed Program DRAFT Performance Indicators and Measurement Summary
-

**Meeting Summary - February 28, 2002**  
**California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee**  
**Water Supply Subcommittee**

**Attendance**

Committee members and alternates in attendance: Gary Bobker, Steve Hall, Jerry Meral, Barry Nelson, Francis Spivy-Weber, Tom Zuckerman, Randall Neudeck (Tim Quinn), Alan Zepp (George Fraser), Richard Denton (Greg Gartrell), Bernice Sullivan (Dan Fults)

**Subcommittee Role, Responsibilities**

Co-chairs Steve Hall and Jerry Meral reviewed the Subcommittee's role and responsibilities. They announced that membership of the Subcommittee will be comprised of interested California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee members and their alternates. Other individuals will be invited to become members as needed.

Meeting frequency will be bi-monthly or as frequent as needed.

**Action Items:**

- Update Subcommittee Description to include membership criteria, frequency of meetings and decision-making process.
- Develop membership list.

**Subcommittee 2002 Priorities and Measures for Success**

The Co-chairs proposed the following:

***2002 Draft Priorities:***

1. Assess Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework.
2. Identify projects critical to success of Program, assess those projects and provide recommendations to California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee. For 2002, the "critical path" projects are In-Delta Storage, North Delta Flood Control/Ecosystem Restoration/Conveyance and South Delta Improvements.
3. Review work plans for storage, conveyance and water transfers Program elements.
4. Increase credibility of CALFED water management programs in Legislature, Congress and by the public
5. Clarify issues of cost allocation

***Draft Measures for Success (Subcommittee and Program):***

1. Agreement on Subcommittee priorities (Subcommittee)
2. Identification of critical path projects (Subcommittee and Program)
3. Identify appropriate funding for critical path projects (Subcommittee and Program)
4. Increased legislative and public support for CALFED water management programs (Subcommittee and Program)
5. Completed Work Plans (Program)
6. Completed Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework (Program)

**Action Items:**

- Refine priorities and measures for success for March 12, 2002 subcommittee report to Committee
- Schedule for March subcommittee meeting review of Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework and priorities/measures of success.

**Updates**

The Subcommittee discussed updates on 3 projects with CALFED Program and Agency staff:

- Expansion of Banks Pumping to 8,500 cfs
- In-Delta Storage Investigation
- North Delta Improvements

**Action Item:**

- Schedule review of Delta Implementation Plan for April 24 Subcommittee meeting. Consider joint meeting with Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee.

**Future Meetings**

March 20, 2002

9:00 am to 12:00 pm

Sacramento, Location TBD

Agenda items:

- Finalize Subcommittee Priorities and Measures for Success
- Appoint Subcommittee Membership
- Review Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework

April 24, 2002

1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Sacramento, Location TBD

Agenda Item:

- Review Delta Implementation Plan
- Others TBD

**DRAFT Meeting Summary - March 20, 2002**  
**California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee**  
**Water Supply Subcommittee**

**Attendance**

Subcommittee members and alternates in attendance: Steve Hall, Jerry Meral, Gary Bobker, Francis Spivy-Weber, Tom Zuckerman, Tim Quinn, Alan Zepp (George Fraser), Richard Denton (Greg Gartrell), Bernice Sullivan (Dan Fults)

***The meeting focused on the following agenda items:***

- Finalize 2002 Subcommittee Priorities & Measures for Success;
- Appoint Subcommittee Membership;
- Review (CALFED) Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework;
- Public Comment.

The majority of the meeting focused on the CALFED Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework presentation (Ken Kirby, Mark Cowin). The presentation generated a great deal of discussion with regard to the strategies, goals, implementation, progress and the relevance to the BDPAC water supply subcommittee deliberations.

**2002 Subcommittee Priorities & Measures for Success**

A BDPAC subcommittee priority for 2002 is to focus on evaluating critical path projects. A critical path project is identified as one: (a) where a decision needs to be made in the immediate future; and (b) that provides balance to the competing needs for water.

The level of funding needed to evaluate all CALFED projects may not be available, thus the need to focus on critical path projects.

***Critical path projects identified were:***

- In-Delta storage;
- Clarify how ecosystem restoration elements of the North Delta Flood Control Improvements Project fit into the general scheme of the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program;
- Clarify ecosystem restoration elements of the South Delta Improvements Program and their relationship to the North Delta ecosystem restoration elements;
- Review schedules and budgets for the CALFED surface storage projects;
- Investigate the progress made in determining methods of cost allocation for funding proposed projects and programs.

A future focus of the subcommittee will be on the North of Delta Offstream Storage Investigation, Sites Reservoir alternative.

**Subcommittee Membership**

Membership will be made up of California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee members or their identified alternates. Full participation by other attendees at the

meetings is strongly encouraged. This will ensure that a broad scope of interest group, policy and regulatory perspectives are represented.

### **CALFED Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework**

A briefing on the Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework (WMSEF) was presented by CALFED. The presentation focused on:

- Background of WMSEF;
- Evaluation of System versus Individual Project Investigations;
- Recent evaluation framework strategies;
- Results from new Draft Report;
- Potential Roles for Evaluation Framework;
- Feedback and Next Steps.

#### ***Major issues and comments:***

1. Understanding the purpose of the WMSEF and its relationship with Record of Decision. It was explained the WMSEF is a tool for finding a system-wide approach that will best integrate projects to satisfy the Record of Decision.
2. Concern that using the WMSEF will revise the ROD. Some members suggested that reevaluation was necessary because of changing situations, including new information on projects and funding limitations.
3. Balance. Perception is that the majority of CALFED work has been focused on Ecosystem Restoration. Funding projects for increasing water supply are needed.
4. WMSEF evaluation criteria. Need to be reviewed, either overall or in the context of individual projects. Review of cost/benefit evaluation criteria and in-stream flow requirements may be in order and will require peer review.
5. Assessing alternatives to storage and conveyance projects. Future analyses using WMSEF should update assumptions with regards to water conservation, retirement of agricultural land, etc.
6. Future of WMSEF. Provide implementation assistance and project coordination by doing the following: (1) help establish benchmark assumptions to be used for analyzing all projects; (2) help conduct cumulative impact analysis for each project; (3) recommend additional analyses, and (4) develop and refine analytical tools and data management processes.
7. WMSEF Budget. Current funding is \$1.5 million and there is no funding, yet, for next year.

#### **Action Items**

- Develop work plan and budget for Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework for this year;

- Provide the Subcommittee members with a summary of the Benefit and Cost Allocation Process work plan;
- Provide the Subcommittee members and other participants access to the Draft CALFED Report “Evaluating and Comparing Proposed Water Management Actions; A Component of the Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework”;
- Develop a page on the CALFED web site to provide access to materials related to the Subcommittee.

**Future Meetings**

April 24, 2002

1:00 pm to 4:00 pm

Sacramento, Location TBD

Draft Agenda Items:

- Delta Wetlands Storage Project
- Scope and Budget of Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework
- CALFED Bay-Delta Program Storage and Conveyance Program Budgets

**Meeting Summary – April 24, 2002**  
**California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee**  
**Water Supply Subcommittee**

**Attendance**

Subcommittee members and alternates in attendance: Steve Hall, Jerry Meral, Gary Bobker, Barry Nelson, Tom Zuckerman, Tim Quinn, Alan Zepp (George Fraser), Richard Denton (Greg Gartrell), Lloyd Fryer (Tom Clark)

***The meeting focused on the following agenda items:***

- Delta Wetlands Storage Project;
- Scope of CALFED Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework (WMSEF);
- South Delta Improvement Program Status;
- CALFED Bay-Delta Program Storage and Conveyance Program Budgets.

The following provides a summary of the major discussion points presented in the meeting.

**Delta Wetlands Storage Project**

- The target release date for a status report on the feasibility of various in-Delta storage projects is May 8<sup>th</sup>. This feasibility investigation has been a collaborative effort between state and federal agencies, stakeholders, and technical experts. The major difficulty faced in completing the investigation has been finding common ground among the technical experts with regard to technical and policy issues.
- The report will provide information on a broad range of aspects of the projects investigated, including impacts on water quality, water supply, and construction costs. A preliminary (straw man) benefit and cost analysis will be described. However, an overall benefit and cost analysis is premature at this time. A policy to identify beneficiaries needs to be established prior to finalizing the benefit and cost analysis.
- The linkage between the in-Delta storage project and other projects being investigated in the CALFED program is not being considered at this time. These linkages would be explored as part of future planning efforts.
- An independent science board will review the evaluation results. The engineering design elements have already been reviewed by an independent engineering consulting board. The science board will provide a qualified review of the evaluation and make suggestions for further analyses.

**Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework (WMSEF)**

- Staff proposed that resources formerly dedicated to developing the WMSEF be assigned to form a CALFED “Implementation Support Team” (CIST) to assist in coordinating the activities necessary to fulfill the requirements common among individual water management project investigations specified in the ROD.

- The CIST would assist CALFED project planning teams by helping to develop a set of common assumptions and an approach for modeling a no action alternative that all project investigations can use and for modeling and analyses of cumulative effects for all CALFED water supply actions. The CIST would provide recommendations of performance measures and analytical tools for predicting project performance and create a library for most recent data, modeling results, and analytical tools.
- The CIST could also improve coordination and communication among project teams, CALFED Management Group, BDPAC, and Policy Group.

### **South Delta Improvements**

- Alternatives being explored are increase in pumping rates, operable barriers within the Delta and fish screen alternatives. An EIR/EIS will be prepared and completion is expected by middle of 2003. This delay stems from issues with regard to CVP/SWP operations, which are being discussed with stakeholders to help determine operational rules. Information will be provided to the Subcommittee on the status of this project.
- A proposal to make the South Delta Improvements Group a working group of the BDPAC water supply subcommittee was presented, however, the committee would prefer not to have such a working group.

### **CALFED Bay-Delta Program Storage and Conveyance Program Budgets**

- Significant budget cuts are being made to most programs, but some programs are not in jeopardy because of bond funding. There are significant cuts in funding from the state's general fund, and federal funding is at lower than expected levels. Consequently, project and staff funds, local assistance programs, and program balance are at risk.
- The Subcommittee recognized that if required funding is not maintained, the CALFED program would fail legal and public requirements and the Program will become unbalanced.
- Even though significant bond money is available, it will not allow for a balanced program. Loss of staff and schedule delays will hurt the overall effort

### **Future Meetings**

June 19, 2002

9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Bonderson Building

Hearing Room 102 A

901 P Street

Sacramento, CA

Draft Agenda Items:

- Delta Wetlands Storage Project;
- Other agenda items to be determined

**CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
STEERING COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE**

**Draft Meeting Outcomes**

---

**Meeting Date/Location**      March 12, 2002  
Sacramento Convention Center  
1400 J Street  
Sacramento

---

**Members in attendance:** Gary Bobker, Ryan Broddrick, Marci Coglianese, Martha Davis, Steve Hall, Gary Hunt, Leslie Lohse, Jerry Meral, Timothy Quinn, Francis Spivy-Weber, Marguerite Young, Tom Zuckerman

**Debrief Committee Meeting and Next Steps**

Members expressed concerns with SB 1658 (Costa). Continuing discussion from the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee meeting immediately preceding the subcommittee meeting, some members suggested a small membership to facilitate decision-making and others supported a broader membership to better represent stakeholder interests. Regardless of membership, there was a question about whether a new Commission would enable the public to better understand CALFED related issues.

Members also discussed federal lobbying limitations and the need for more discussion on federal and state budgeting issues.

**Action Items**

- Subcommittee members were supportive of working with Senator Costa to work through the details on SB 1658 and move it through the Legislative process.
- Subcommittee asked Patrick Wright (CALFED Bay-Delta Program Director) to form a finance work group to work on state and federal budget issues. Members of the work group would include Committee members.
- Chair Gary Hunt asked for clarification of and an update on federal lobbying limitations.



## Memorandum

Date: June 19, 2002  
To: California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
From: Eugenia Laychak, Committee Facilitator and Coordinator  
Subject: Process for Making Committee Recommendations to CALFED Agencies

On June 27, 2002, the Committee is scheduled to deliberate on a Water Supply Subcommittee recommendation. Since this will be the first opportunity for the Committee to act on a Subcommittee action, provided below is an overview of the Committee's decision-making framework.

### Committee Charter

The Charter lists the duties of the Committee. To summarize, the Committee's duties are solely advisory and include making recommendations on CALFED Bay-Delta Program balance, effective integration and priorities to the Secretary of the Department of Interior and Governor of California, through the CALFED Policy Group. The Committee may also recommend Program actions based on recommendations from Committee subcommittees (Page 2).

The Charter allows the Committee to establish subcommittees for purposes of compiling information or conducting research. However, the subcommittees must report to the full Committee with their recommendations to the CALFED agencies. The full Committee is then to deliberate on and determine whether to adopt subcommittee recommendations (page 4).

### Process for Making Committee Recommendations

A process for forwarding recommendations to CALFED agencies and Policy Group and for receiving feedback on recommendations is provided below:

1. Committee adopts subcommittee priorities (adopted on March 12, 2002).
2. Subcommittees develop recommendations for Committee. Affected agencies, Program staff and the public participate in subcommittee dialogue. Most subcommittees have adopted a collaborative process for discussion and making recommendations.

---

#### CALFED Agencies

##### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Water Resources  
Department of Fish and Game  
The Reclamation Board  
Delta Protection Commission  
Department of Conservation  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Health Services  
Department of Food and Agriculture

##### Federal

Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

3. Subcommittee recommendations forwarded to Committee by Subcommittee co-chairs. Recommendations include requested action and background, with an overview of subcommittee discussions and outcomes. Recommendations may be forwarded with support of agencies or Program.
4. Committee deliberations. Agencies and Program have opportunity to comment on subcommittee recommendations in writing or at Committee meeting. Committee will adopt, modify, table, or reject recommendations.
5. Committee recommendations considered by CALFED Policy or Management Group (depending on issues and Policy Group delegation of tasks to Management Group).
6. Policy or Management Group will report back to Committee and/or Subcommittee with reasons and basis for decisions.

# CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE TOUR

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 2002  
Jean Harvie Community Center  
14273 River Road, Walnut Grove

Time: Tour from 1 pm to 5:30 pm

Tour: The tour will be via vans provided by Department of Water Resources. The tour will make a number of short stops to discuss Delta features and CALFED programs.

Jean Harvie Community Center is a large structure next to and below the levee on the east bank of the Sacramento River. Walnut Grove is approximately halfway between Sacramento and Stockton on the banks of the Sacramento River.

From Davis and Sacramento: Take I-5 south to Twin Cities Road. Turn right/west. At River Road, turn left/south. Pass Locke. Pass the stop sign at the Bridge. JHCC is south of town on the left.

From Stockton: Take I-5 north to Walnut Grove-Thornton Road, turn left/west. At the River, the road turns right/north and becomes River Road. JHCC Community Center is south of town on the right.

From East Bay: Take 4 east. Follow signs to Highway 160 and Antioch Bridge; there is a \$2 toll. Follow Highway 160 north past Highway 12 intersection, past Ileton. At the Walnut Grove Bridge cross the Sacramento River and turn right/south on River Road. JHCC is south of town on the left.

NOTE: Correspondence included in the BDPAC meeting packet is on file at the CALFED office. To obtain a copy of the correspondence section, please contact the office at (916) 657-2666.

The In-Delta Storage Program Draft Summary Report (May 2002), was also included in the meeting packet (bound separately). The report is available on the CALFED website [http://calfed/current\\_pubs.html](http://calfed/current_pubs.html).