

Agency Revision Team
June 3, 1998

Marti Kie, Conservation Strategy

Soliciting agency representation. Please provide Marti with names of contact people.
Developing list of species. Distributed handout.

Wendy

Meeting next Wednesday, 9-12, room to be determined.
Tomorrow at Policy Group, taking list of elevated and new issues.

Kathy-refill criteria and conveyance priority-want to see. Don't think they need to be brought to policy yet.

Wendy--not here to debate but to identify issues. holding to timeline. Dale will be bad cop.

Michael--does anyone need handouts from yesterday--see Michael f.

Dick Daniel, Ecosystem Restoration Program

ERP Issue #1

Terry, Dick and Stein working together on ERP implementation strategy. We've hired scientists to work with them. August 28 draft. Refinement following for final.

Issue ok as is.

Dick is working to have a draft document available for Preferred Alternative (PA). PA, not final.
Dick--chapter on permit ...

ERP #2, Impacts.

Don't have commitment, but doubt its a problem, to do restoration on agency lands. Needs to be worked out though. Also sent letters to reclamation districts in delta.

Robin Reynolds. Should be PA, not final. First tier of analysis.

Penny. Include process in PA.

Dick. in EIS/R document, recognize impact to ag land our policy is to go this way or that.

Wendy--that's already captured. we just need to disclose impacts.

Robin R.

Frank W. never mind

Carolyn. We're at a level of discussion I wasn't prepared for. I agree good reason to go with public lands first, but when we get there, you'll strategically have to consider other areas for working on first

Dick. I agree--the science team will help with that. ...tidal wetland restoration.

Wendy. implementation strategy will discuss this.

Dick. More likely in environmental impact portion. The implementation is science driven.

They'll develop framework. May identify id tidal wetlands first, for example.

Wendy--Trying to identify whether this goes into ERP implementation or into implementation document.

Penny--This is an issue. Has 2 or 3 facets

Facet 1-policy question - Are we going to do this. May want to elevate. (take land out of production for habitat). Dick-If that's an issue, elevate it tomorrow. ERP assumes land will be taken out of production. Robin-It's an issue.

Facet 2-keep going back to "it's in the document, it's mitigated." Need the comfort level in the document or the mitigate piece, which may fall off. in project description. Penny & Dick - - need policy decision-will mean revising main document.

Wendy-hold the new issue until end.

Robin-avoid & reduce, vs mitigation

Wendy-state issue

Robin -add mitigation to this issue #2, and move when to PA rather than final.

Dick-I can't agree to mitigation.

Kathy-that's an elevation.

ACTION: Robin to write a 2-page issue paper on his issue, identifying and clearly stating, following format we discussed yesterday.

Rick B-this issue comes out every policy group, not a new issue.

Penny-But it's never been keyed up for thorough discussion. These issue papers will lay that out.

Frank W-So it comes back here?

Wendy-yes, next Wednesday.

Kathy-This is not Robin's issue. He wants to add "mitigate" and the program manager doesn't.

Dick-We're committed to do avoid and minimize.

Dale - Issue is clarified.

ERP #3

What will be the governance?

Julie. How does this fit in with Stein's issues - are these the same thing?

Michael F.-John is doing a paper.

Penny-I don't think this is strictly institutional. It includes adaptive management and how it's carried out.

Dick-Guy from British Columbia on core team, expert in adaptive management. We'll have a good product for review by PA, 8/28.

Frank W-DFG issue may fit here. Adaptive mgt-our view of ERP is intricate web of habitats - may be a process that says we've done 100 acres of mitigation but removed 30,000 acres. Want whole thing woven as a vision to ensure it doesn't fall short.

Dick-That comes from assurances and staging negotiations.

Frank W-ok, its a new issue for later.

Carolyn-There seem to be 2 things: 1st is adaptive mgt, 2nd is how best to house that activity. It may be better to separate these issues. Allow institutional question under implementation. With adaptive mgt-do you need to better define what that is?

Dick-Yes, need to define, but have to make sure institution can do it. OK with me to separate.

Carolyn-I don't expect core team of scientists to do institutional.

Dick-Not completely, but they're the ones that have the experience, will address.

Wendy-take second part off of this issue and John will include in his write up.

Walt-Need to identify adaptive mgt and approach.

Wendy-Does this first sentence cover that?

Carolyn-need to rephrase.

Kathy-adaptive mgt is not defined at an adequate level of detail.

Walt-First, there's a need to scientifically and technically implement. Then you can do institutional implementation.

Julie-In the workplan, take out second sentence.

Penny-Simplified -- what is it, how will it be done, who will implement

ACTION: Wendy-let's recraft this one and bring it back to the group.

Penny-what is it needs to be defined by PA

ERP #4, diversion effects

Kathy-don't think elevate box needs to be checked.

Kathy-this is essential information. Strategic plan core team--need names this week.

Dale-by next mtg

Carolyn-thought it was murky. want to add water quality to this issue, also wordsmithing.

Patrick L-adding water quality us ok, but not the wordsmithing.

Carolyn - want to understand what pl is saying.

Gary-concur with Patrick. The main issue is restoring natural flow patterns.

Frank W-where does water quality go?

Earl-there are others too. They all need to be addressed. I was going to bring it up as a new issue.

fw-

dw-we're comfortable that we're addressing water quality.

Frank W-add improving water quality, reducing stressors.

Gary-main issue-I've heard people say that since we have ERP, we don't need to worry about natural flows through the Delta. I think that's the issue Dick is trying to identify here.

Dick-the team on diversion effects is looking at that. Not looking at ag or drinking water quality.

Frank W-I see a pkg of things where you're saying will these do it.

Wendy-is that an issue

Julie-See two issues. First, end sentence after fish populations. Second is you may need reductions in diversion effects, flow patterns.

Dick-if we change word "without" to "absent", does that clarify.

yes!

Penny-Gary was saying there's an issue that even if we restore populations, what's the break point, when does it become water mgt issue.

Dick-that's what ESA regulatory agencies are responsible for.

Dick-issue is you CAN'T do enough habitat to no longer care about diversion effects

Earl-how do you determine best mix re stressors

Dick-adaptive mgt

Wendy-that's beyond this issue.

Robin -Stressors other than diversion effects and flow patterns need to be addressed in this manner. Harvest predation, etc.

Gary- new issue. Are there other stressors that can be addressed that can substitute.

Dale-let's make that a new issue rather than putting in it here.

Steve-supporting Earl

ERP #5

Geographic scope-does it include enough of the bay?

Penny-enlarge it to include upper watershed. Lake Davis is linked to Delta but habitat in upper

watershed isn't.

Dick-geog scope of ERP runs from crest of sierra--already included.

pl-I don't think so. I think we're moving backwards. new issue.

separate from bay issue

Walt-not a scope issue. issue is whether it's being adequately addressed. sierras are in scope.

john-is adequately attention being given to issues in upper watershed,

fw-keep this unchanged. make other part a new issue.

kk-okay with boxes?

ph-insert "south" bay area.

cy-ok with final

fw-like this wording. it says "extent". would be helpful to have in PA.

fw-move to PA if possible. but Final is ok.

dd-policy call was that ERPP would address stressors in delta. if delta fish are unhappy you can go anywhere to do anything to make them happy. no one can show us the nexus relating the south bay to delta fish.

issue ok

ERP issue #6

ok as is

ERP issue #7

pursuing consensus on method, not on how many cfs

rr-

cy-are 7 & 8 the same? is one or the other preferable.

dd-8 seems better.

who-drop 7 or merge them

drop 7 is consensus

ERP issue #8

ok as is? Wendy

when & type

ph-PA

dd-no can do. pursue thru market and development per policy call.

ph-in draft

cy-sympathize with ph. certainly won't be completed even by final.

dd-there are flow targets in ERPP won't change between now and PA

kk-split into 2 issues, one is timing. in pa or revised draft, discuss process in as much detail as you can, status report in draft. for PA have process, for final have decision.

dd-I can do that.

ph-ok

cy-split the two issues. assessment of flows is one thing. workplan refers to assessment of needed flows. variety of options can we talk about timing for needed flows. are we talking about whole issue statement

Gary-identical issue to Carolyn's. flow assessment issue should be separated from how to achieve flow conditions.

dale-people are agreeing with Gary.

ERP issue #9

conceptual model was an SRP idea. CMARP working on that.

kk-new issue may fit here. shallow water habitat. ESO says inadequate impact analysis with certain alts due to shallow ... nonnative species, temp issues, predation issues with this habitat. is this issue wrapped up in issue #9. more is better for aquatic and shallow water habitat.

earl-I think it can. that's where all of the stressors are factored in and you can show the nexus between problem and solution and whether solution will work. if model does what it should, it should show....

dd-every action proposed is result of evaluating a model . each has testable hypothesis. adaptive mgt is refining models, testing hypothesis and making decisions.

earl and frank w both agree Kathy's issue fits into issue #9.

7 new issues

will we take land out of production. elevate

will we mitigate ag land. elevate

haven't adequately defined adaptive mgt

haven't adequately adapt mgt paradigm

institutional structure

EIS doesn't --stressors

ERP doesn't -- watershed areas

ph-I'm more visual. need to see them.

who-I think we covered some of these in other issues. let's ask people to bring up any issues they feel weren't covered.

new #1

will we take land out of production.

ph-rr should recast the issue #2.

new #2

mitigation will be included in recasting of #2

3, 4, 5 all were adaptive management related. dick will recharacterize better and bring back to group.

6-EIS doesn't adequately define stressors

7-watershed areas-is that covered under watershed program?

Patrick's new issue:

the ERPP isn't dealing with the ecosystem. have to go beyond stream channels and immediate vegetation. just in sac valley portion, 21 pages of comments from a staffer. is each one an issue?

dd-if the issue is to

pl-I'm not convinced the ERP addresses the delta and bay adequately.

pl-need agreement on targets, goals

earl-

Julie-people see that the riparian areas affect larger areas. need clearer definition on what ERP is focusing on. people see ecosystem and think of ecosystem, not one small focus of ecosystem.
kk-pl seems to have two issues: 1-issue on what ERPP is designed., 2. another on how comments are treated by staff. if you have an overarching issue on how ERPP is defined, should be addressed here and keyed up.

who-Patrick should explain issue

pl-does the ERPP adequately target all of the

mf-the ERPP isn't focused on entire ecosystem but needs to expand...

Walt-the entire ecosystem approach isn't issue-but interaction between appropriate watersheds. if you change mgt practices, what are effects and components of eco which affect the delta. need nexus

ph-Patrick needs to come up with wording for next mtg.

Patrick will frame this issue for next mtg

Gary new issue

ERPP should further promote concept and importance of key watersheds in the valley.

who-could be similar to one of Patrick' issues.

Gary-could be watershed, but would be broader scale.

Gary new issue

adaptive mgt has tech and practical limitations and thus cannot be cornerstone of rest process but is one of ..

Gary new issue

the ERPP may not address all steelhead issues as effectively as it does Chinook salmon.

Gary new issue

variety of issues with returning of anadromous

how well does ERPP address blowing up dams, fish ladders and returning fish to historical habitats. safe harbor issues

returning fish to historical habitats raises a variety of issues for landowners in the area.

Gary new issue

the ERPP may not be best forum to discuss all hatchery issues in the central valley.

Gary new issue

focused research is an impo aspect of eco rest and shouldn't be relegated to a minor role
additional info on life history and habitats -- chinook and steelhead needed. research is an impo role.

fw new issue

I'm willing to put mine into the established format for next meeting. should we do this will any new issues.

dick-some of this comes to me as a surprise 3 yrs into the process.

Kathy new issue

recreation impacts. CALFED hasn't addressed or what we'll do about it. does it fit here?

who-yes. get issue to who or mf and we'll package it up. we'll get copies to dick.

get to Wendy next Monday so she can work up for next meeting, but won't be a topic of discussion.

Levee issues, Rob Cooke

Gary-do we have to rethink this whole approach to flood control in the delta. if so, phase iii is too late. we need to resolve so we can change our direction.

does the govt want to pay for this kind of flood control.

rob-what is the ecosystem worth. we can quantify cost, but not benefits. bc ratio doesn't apply.

kk-there may need to be some movement on getting a change or acknowledgement of benefits...is it possible that this issue sb brought to policy for discussion it may prompt corps to make overtures to their mgt to make changes in their system.

rob-talked to Walter Yep we can put eco benefits into bc ration now that would allow them to participate in cost sharing. not a done deal, but working gon it.

kk-if as Gary says we change the program we need to elevate. if can just be acknowledged and handle on step by step in phase iii this is ok. what is risk of this issue changing the program. what do we do about that.

ph-depending on how it changes, if, could erode the entire reason why large no. of people are even engaged in this process. stakeholders. if we don't care about this or that island. that kind of broad change, we need a decision before phase iii.

rob-we've have levee program in delta for 25 yrs, if we change, we lose lot of support.

ph-if it changes that much, ph iii much too late.

kk-not sure of significance of issue.

ph-can we get status in about a month.

rob-not sure how much progress Walter will make in about a month, but I can ask him. he's confident but takes time.

tom-people have known from the outset. policy decision was made a long time ago, its a common program.

ph-some kind of levee program, but

rob-CALFED mgt will accept corps levee standard, first come first serve not a lot of controversy

how do we fund. corps has regulations.

ph-pl99 if still doing i misunderstood

earl-may have to cut back on lower priority items.

rob-for political reasons, first come first serve

john-not prioritized

rob-only for enhancements

ph-I'm ok with ph iii, as is

levee #2

kk-I don't think we need

who-we talked about this with stein.

consensus to move to stein's linkages stuff.

kk-we didn't address integration did we

who yes we did.

cy-

pl-we see slightly different. proper integration of goals and objectives of program. should not be fixed with managers dumping to others. I don't think we should send it to stein. just make sure levee program adopts ERPP and wq goals as well. that changes nature of actions levee program might make.

kk-this issue is more an implementation issue as characterized here.

this other one, don't know if its significant but don't want to lose sight of...if levee program isn't taking full advantage of,

pl-I think this is a levee issue.

cy-

pl-levees and channels tech team should be working on this

rob-just happen to have an overhead on the process.

ph-can you change workplan effort to

pl-I don't think it's a conservation strategy issue

rob-me neither but I think it needs to be followed

pl-the levee program should be designed on with this in mind

rob-it is being so.

Julie-do you want to clarify this to say that program elements and goals are consistent between programs.

pl-yes, and final is better target

levee #3

Julie-does this go with rr's white paper

no, it's Steve

Steve-yes.

who-elevate

levee #4

Julie-I think this is under conveyance, implementation strategy.

kk-workplan

eliminate this - covered elsewhere

levee #5

Gary-questions. do we have proven means to reverse subsidence.

rob-we want to landside berms provide stability and stop subsidence. we want a grant program for bmp's.

kk-levee berms won't stop subsidence. the island will subside with peat soil.

rob-the materials consolidate.

kk-the island will continue to subside if farmed the same way.

rob-CALFED doesn't address inner island subsidence.

Julie-how about subsidence mgt instead of reversal.

kk-is this policy issue.

rob-we want to pursue the inner island subsidence, but this issue doesn't address that.

kk-address subsidence near levee.

john-this refers to local area of levees and effect on levees, not the entire island.

rob-current subsidence rates will not endanger for next 50-100 years.

kk-who generated this issue.

who-phase ii report

Wendy-not hearing disagreement, just exploration. move on.

levee issue #6

pl-when is a little late. at least for identifying a process.

rob-i agree.

dale-to when

pl-part for PA, but not whole.

rob-soem stakeholders will want to see movement before buying in.

kk-is this adapt mgt issue, is there linkage with ERPP. we talk about impacts

rob-linkages-yes.

kk-yes, adapt mgt,

rob-we need to dredge. would be nice to use that material.

ERP wants to dredge, etc., that's the linkage. in addressing ERP impacts, want levee side berms.

kk-erpp may adversely affect levees. my point is what?

dale-is this ok?

frank p-move it up. for 404 ok to wait, but not nepa/ceqa.

kk-my point is I didn't see this under ERPP, does it merit that attention in the ERPP.

frank p-

rob-dick and I are working together on this.

Marti-in workplan, include conservation strategy.

Wendy-are you aware on ongoing dredging going on now. it will change landscape of delta.

navy. port of Stockton. millions of cubic yards. not enough for levee integrity, but huge impact.

dale-is this a new issue.

who-is this ok?

kk-yes, moved up to PA and final.

levee issue #7

Julie-isn't 5 & 7 the same.

who-let's discuss.

cy-yes

ph-can we merge 7 with 5

Walt-one is levee integrity solely, this one also with maintenance and inter-island activities. we made the point on 5 that it was strictly levees.

dale-let's deal with this one, is it ok?

Wendy-ok as is.

ss-workplan, tell me - set local cost share, etc.

rob-similar to #1. don't want to invest a lot on fay islands. if you have 10% cost share for locals, would exclude some. they would make the decision.

john-I see relationship to #1, like rob

fw-suggest last sentence be struck in workplan.

cy-does this mean waterways?

rob-waterways, levee configuration.

fw-that sentence reads like a new issue.

strike it.

levee #8

kk-biggie with DWR. due to facilities we have out there. central district says levee program doesn't address ... glad to see it's checked elevated.
fw-volunteered to draft issue paper.
ph-remember to lay out all perspectives.

levee #9

ph-having trouble figuring out what we're trying to do.
fp-clarifying remarks. vegetation on levee....
ph-should vegetation be on levees or not.
rob-a little deeper, but that's the essence. we need to have dredging. listings have shut down dredging on state side.
ph-
kk-access to levees for maintenance. first paragraph
rob-overall permit process for
rick b-streamlining permitting.
kk-PA ok good luck
Wendy-vegetation doesn't belong on every square foot, but some is ok. let's not ask if vegetation belongs, it's how much and what type.
ph-this came up before at policy. it would be nice to capture this for policy.
earl-it becomes habitat for endangered species so you can't go into do maintenance.
rob-safe harbor
who-we need to rewrite this issue.
pl-disagree with frank p-first paragraph of workplan is the issue.
who-we'll redraft this.

levee #10

who-didn't we already talk about this. inner island subsidence
ph-okay as is.
kk-this is bigger issue-to be elevated.
dale-
kk-subsidence control on inner island. and assoc ag impacts. will we emphasize need highly controversial . subsidence mgt isn't well tested. need policy guidance. not volunteering to write paper.
kk-the issue could be more clearly stated--does the CALFED program address inner island subsidence management within te delta. process seems appropriate.
Julie-what does this have to do with anything.
ph-if we strengthen levees. and subsidence continues, do we want to do that.
Gary-isn't that #5
ph-it's a policy call whether we care.
Walt-no clear on what the issue is. we already have bathtubs. it will only be exacerbated over time. habitat rest.
earl-what's the significance of 100 years.
Walt-groundwater is ..what's the issue.
tom-the question is, is this a concern.
kk-CALFED is a long-term solution.
Walt-we could lay something out,
Lynn-the issue is that subsidence subteam has determined that there's a certain width around

outside of island zone of influence that impacts the levees. meanwhile sub inside but doesn't impact levees. ERPP looks at helping certain sub in some donut holes of some donuts. there's a gap. maybe we don't care, may be outside of CALFED. just want it known there's a gap. not a corps issue we only care about levees.

ph-you don't have to carry the flag

fw-we'd be happy to frame the issue to get it moving.

Walt-Larry brings it up due to water quality.

dale-move on.

Walt volunteered to assist fw.

ss-counsel you to address private property and land use.

kk-seems like CALFED staff raised issue and was seeking guidance. since they have most information seems that they should write, but if fw is willing to volunteer, ok.

frank w and Walt.

dale-lunch at noon, then wq. finance won't be ready.

any new issues for levees?

Gary- close to #1. levee program is continuing traditional approach to the problems of vulnerability in the delta. program's ability to provide for system integrity is limited.

who-are you advocating a diff approach.

Gary-this may just elaborate on #1. cost vs benefits

Wendy-

CALFED hinges on existing configuration and integrity. do we have a plan to keep that in near-term stable or have emergency response if something happens. to keep current configuration.

rob-that's my operating assumption.

who-we discussed this under #7

kk-this is a given, we founded the program on this. to maintain delta.

ph-does nmfs have a problem with that assumption.

Gary-should we add "at any cost" to keeping

Gary-should we maintain current delta configuration at any cost

kk-what is criteria to determine whether to maintain. I'm hearing Gary

earl-what are the thresholds at which we'll stop

rob-we'll discover that with assurances, who will pay

Wendy-if we don't maintain, project consequences.

who-elevating? Gary taking lead on issue paper.

Gary requested assistance, not heard.

frank w

fundament flaw in cost ratio ... e have to maintain ... not get into battles on cost-ratios. may be counter point to Gary.

frank will frame his issue. not yet determined if it will be elevated.

lunch break

Rick B - clarification of linkages. What Stein and Rob were referring to wasn't the same thing.

Rick W, Water Quality

WQ #1

explanation of issue.

Dale explained process in this ART mtg.

who-didn't this come up under WUE. regulatory vs incentive based

ph-that's part of the paper I have to write.

cy-don't think this is the same.

earl-disconnect between workplan title and description. does there need to be a workplan so policy can make a decision when this matures. or is it premature because there hasn't been a workplan.

rick w-my interpretation is that it doesn't need to be talked about

rb-it will.

rw-sb1108 offers safe harbor on state side for certain kinds of good Samaritan acts for toxic cleanups. not on federal side. hazard with toxic site for agencies to assume responsibility for cleanup. has t be resolved before we spend money on activity, if we spend money on activity.

copper mercury metals.

ph-different than my write up

cy-EPA discussions. our people under impression they'll identify ...additional steps needed. by PA and final, EPA will have clearer reading on what those actions might be.

rw-6 teams charge to develop more detail, on fix nd priorities, not officially charge with identifying implementation.

cy-it will come up and that info will be there.

rw-that may be an appropriate forum. may not need additional work than what we're already doing.

dale-is it ok?

cy-s/b final timeframe, not ph iii

kk-re workplan . needs to be fleshed out more. recommend fleshing out workplan. perhaps break out issue more.

Walt-what is issue. is this limited to mining?

rw-no. lot of places this can come up. coordination between agencies on how to handle these kind of things.

cy-need feature in workplan the extent to which groups are addressing these issues. list personnel on those groups.

process box

final box

wq#2

ph-not by PA?

rw-I see integration as more of a phased approach

who-three tiered approach stein mentioned, which increasing detail.

cy-Bruce Macler note. would like activity sooner. should help with selection of pa, and then move forward.

who-yes, that's the progression I was alluding to

pl-perhaps new issue. seems that wq is too narrow on drinking water issues. need more env wq.

dale-does env wq fit here.

who-new issue

kk-this is relating to implementation of this common program? we had another issue of pl's re objectives being integrated with other program objectives. did we put that to rest earlier? is this just restricted to implementing common program?

does this issue relate strictly to implementing this common program?

cy-

rw-the pa has to provide objective level has to demonstrate how the objectives of each program work together. I can't help but see that as part of the final document.

kk-I don't see it as an issue.

rb-are you working with rob and dick

rw-yes.

ph- I see an issue - the need to integrate these things. at least in some form by pa so we know what we're trying to do

who-that's being done, it's a progression.

ph-want to keep on table

kk-implementation of programs - that would be in integrate plan. but how objects' of one program complement another - I don't see that as issue, but as something we've been attempting to do.

ph-

who-we'll continue to look for opportunities.

check in all three when boxes

Steve-another nuance. earl's comment this am in ERPP. wq program can provide info by integrating with ERPP in terms of relative effects of diff stressors and how that folds into concept. models. diff integrate issue but goes toward need and bolstering credibility of eir/s.

earl-to rephrase-to what extent wq is being looked at as stressor in erpp and how wq will reduce that.

ss-that's an integration issue.

rw-in large part a wq issue.

earl-if focusing program determine where to best spend money, over here improves drinking wq but no one cares, but over there improves fish populations.

earl-rick needs to tell us if

rw-it's being looked at in that way, we're trying to make it happen. do the mechanisms we have and are developing adequate to the task. my sense is yes. but are there specific activities we're not undertaking that we should.

earl-lot of responsibility resting on ERPP to determine wq parameters to concept models to define what's stressed and alleviated. then wq group can work on that.

type-process

wq#3

we're launching into advance ph iii work to id problems and quantify them, identify corrective measures. prioritization, costing. was an issue when identified, but we're working on this. we have mechanism in place.

not an issue?

rw-yes, until done.

ph-something diff for pa?

check pa, revised doc.

rw-yes

kk-can't figure out what product is. what we'll see.

will you define a process,

rw-both essentially. either in document or implementation doc, specific details on what is proposed for implement. we'll be research and monitoring for some time to understand how to solve some of the other problems. process into ph iii.

kk-we'll have process for all of these then with that approach.

who-isn't the product the revised program plan that demonstrates the work has been done - revised draft is measure of whether we've accomplished the task.

kk-what box?

who-box is mgt tool, not get hung up. focus on workplan box. is this adequate for your concerns.

who we could put in process box, not a discrete decision.

Walt-statements of issues are very general. the type of product/process is vague. left with possibility of identifying what workplan efforts are. we need something more.

kk-to try to flesh out workplan and elaborate, clarify.

Walt-more description of issues. #1-I know other things than metals, but not what. is it ag chemicals, sediment, what? that would be an appropriate approach.

ph-some utility in that. there's a global issues . for revised program description by pa, need call on where components are and how to handle in revised program. some controversial. may need policy call for framing in pa. check back in 4-6 wks, what's outstanding, and frame in more detail.

who-function of our group. want to get agencies immersed in process. if they say you're not covering our issue, they need to tell their rep to bring up issue.

ph-we have issue, we need details within the issue. wq is making progress.

who-I don't want people to think this is gone for 6 weeks.

ph-no, but to revisit, and id which areas might need more

is issue ok? yes, for now.

ph-in 6 wks needs more detail.

rw-product, revision of wq program plan, but probably won't contain all the detail we're developing. just what's appropriate to programmatic doc. perhaps a separate doc to detail additional information that is more than programmatic.

who-prefeasibility study for ph iii

Wendy-would wq be a pa factor. how will it tell me the best alt

rw-will to some extent. but common program elements will be similar. bromide.

Wendy-so it won't be a factor in selection.

ph-because it's common.

rw-the bulk is common.

Wendy-I've heard about bromides, don't have enough to put into decision making.

rw-we are expected expert panel we putting together will shed some light on that issue. but won't have all the answers.

ss-wq program will not be a factor, but some wq elements will be.

rw-policy group will need to know how wq factors in, we'll provide that.

#3 is a tickler. PA box.

wq#4

panel by late July, sooner dependent on contract process. developing questions for panel. Water Quality Technical Group queried.

ph-"highest" is that really the issue - highest quality source water.

Walt-meeting wq standards drinking standards, in terms of bromide in particular.

ph-"highest" infers pristine snow melt in pipe.

kk-take out "highest"

earl-relying on quality of source water vs relying on treatment methods

who-just take "highest" out.

rw-I would say provide highest quality consistent with CALFED goals and objectives. do best we can with wq and all the other programs.

ph-balancing between reliance source water quality and treatment methods.

earl-rw said start with best source water we can & avoid conflict as much as possible.

Julie-how much quality source water vs treatment is the issue. bromide in water.

ph-to frame - are we going to rely on high source water to meet wq standards, or is treatment acceptable. this needs to be forwarded

Walt- its not either or. it's the emphasis on balance.

Julie-there is balance there. more problems if you say "highest" - norther Californians.

john-ricks program is trying to provide balance. but there is disagreement. the program is trying to offer the balance.

earl-balancing source water quality with treatment and balancing stakeholder needs.

cy-don't need stakeholders text tradeoffs are not just how much bromide. there are other wq considerations. cost comparison is important. rick has good process. clarify balancing relationship

whm-we're in agreement. use earl's first statement, without stakeholder.

pl-it's a cost issue. shouldn't focus just on bromide. perhaps separate issue one for bromides & export supply (cost issue), another for all wq.

Walt-some go untreated - salinity. for bromide, not an issue, but thm. the other half is carbon. on my list.

dale-Wendy's wording.

who-doesn't address pl's

Walt and pl disagreeing.

pl-bromide expert panel not part of common program. its a side group because there was an issue. not general question of balancing. how expensive will it be to treat export water if we need to.

dale-is this a new issue.

Walt-bromide group will provide input to process.

pl-but not input to Water Quality Technical Group, input to policy group.

earl-why not to Water Quality Technical Group?

Walt-short circuit in process.

ray-what can we do in program to affect bromides.

rw-very little. some things we could do.

Julie-add to who's - a balance between source wq, treatment and cost.

earl-haven't captured that by improving one area's wq, degrading someone else's.

who-should we try to recraft language and look at it again. doesn't appear to need elevations.

ph-it based on cost, balancing, if we need source vs treatment, yes it should be elevated

who-we'll recraft.
ph-need something by pa.
rw-bromide panel is supposed to do that.
put check in pa box.
caveat- Patrick pointed out cost is major issue. rick will be involved in rewrite per who.
Walt-what is assumed source of bromide -
sea water
Walt-where does drainage come in
rw-recycled water.

wq#5
rw-stakeholder, consensus that dilution is unacceptable. actions that result in increased flow,
may not be outside purview to
policy that we won't dilute.
cy-you'd like to elevate? and have sooner than final?
rw-could be done.
cy-I'll sponsor that.
ph-pa box
Walt-is that the same as dilution will not be a primary source to solve wq problems. not relying
on dilution to solve problems.

new wq issues

cy-I have two. Bruce Macler sent elaborations on issue #4. will leave with Wendy.
1st-policy. reading statement re drainage.
who-explain.
cy-
ph-should CALFED be including completion of the drain.
ss-other out of valley solutions.
cy-recommend elevation. will sponsor with a little help.
ss-in terms of process, these are two pagers with both sides. we should provide input to cy.
who-the draft comes back here next week.
Walt-can we assume that if we take a honest stab, will it be reworked by this group.
tom-out of valley drain isn't in wq plan.
ph-that's the issue - stakeholder issue, not agency issue.
who-art reps should be discussing these issues with mt and pg members so they aren't surprised.

2nd-stakeholders impact analysis for 3 conveyance alts don't address in delta flows under 3 with
selenium....we discussed this yesterday under conveyance. this needs further analysis starting in
pa through ph iii. may help to have -- have process suggestions.
who-
cy-will give who issue statement she brought.

Gary new issue
need help from pl and cy.
nmfs - toxics rule. allowable concentrations for some contaminants in CALFED program are
higher than EPA proposal in toxics rule... FWS and nmfs have biological opinion. looking for

some concentrations considerably less than EPA toxics rule and CALFED program. need program to be consistent with the EPA, FWS&nmfs consultation.

ph-is that a major policy call?

rw-numbers referred to are ctr numbers.

Gary-not familiar, have notes from a staffer. been told that draft wq program in some cases is higher than EPA proposals and much higher than the two services proposal.

rw-we want to be consistent with the result. to extent they change, we'll attempt to be consistent. not worked out yet, once you folks work it out, we'll try to be consistent.

inconsistently in concentrations will be worked out by 3 agencies

Gary-will provide rick w with biological opinion.

pl-why not go with more stringent. CALFED can go beyond EPA standards.

elevate issue

ph-can Gary have staff write the paper.

who-do we need issue paper or frame te issue

just frame

ph-if we go with pl's recommendation to go with most stringent, that is policy call.

dale-bring issue frame back here before elevating.

ss-voluntary vs regulatory. counter point to more protective is that there is a large regulatory infrastructure that CALFED should refer to but not add to . parameters of concern...not in regulatory context, but takes on life of its own. the community is nervous about that. proposed standards should be acknowledged, and if adopted...

pl issue

too narrowly focused on drinking water quality, not enough emphasis on environmental wq. the consultation is one of the kinds of things I was thinking of .

rw-in the wq common program, 95% of actions are directed at eco wq concerns. wq is not oriented around wq. because of bromide separate effort, there's inevitably that impression left. but not accurate. we invited everyone we could think of. attendance is 40 average, 230 on list. information getting out to many who don't come.

Walt-not sure new issue

USGS concern re inorganic carbons. is it high enough to create a drinking water problem. relationship between CALFED proposals and TOC from delta not being adequately addressed.

rw-can't infer that bromide effort is tide in to TOC effort.

rw-choice among alts will affect TOCS policy knows that. 2-can do something about peat island contributions - treatment, mitigate or eliminate sources. that's part of wq common program.

who-is this an issue

Walt-could be folded into some of these ongoing concerns. don't know connections between studies and final...rw-those results won't be available in time for decision. it is possible to do something whether at source or in treatment.

Walt-not prepared to raise this to issue level.

Steve-new issue

left during conveyance yesterday. is wq program range of activities adequately described given diff potential conveyance alts? ie drinking wq with if, in delta ..

who-discussion-large issue - more thorough -- conveyance issue #4.

whm-think it's been addressed. have to look at both sides of picture (conveyance and wq)

ss-we said wq doesn't change much between alts, but I'm not sure that's true. has that been adequately described?

ph-there will be some shifts that happen to each of the common programs, not addressed

who-we have range

ph-that doesn't get to path

who-we're not gonna know the path

ph-we need to

ss-don't know if it's an issue

has the wq program given itself enough latitude, boundary of range of actions, to be adequate in EIS/r, given that there are 3 alts.

rw-one of the few actions that may differ with 0- control of organic carbons in the delta islands. there would be difference in how you would implement that between alts. si large if, you may not need to. alt 1 the converse is true. that's one of the few actions that depends on alts. no point in doing a lesser job with those actions.

ss-in delta ag water quality. Alt 2 not issue, but is with alt 3.

rw-that impact was looked at in the document.

ss-

Steve and rick will talk more.

who-we'll come back to bigger conveyance issue.

Watershed Management, John Lowrie

program is not well-defined or evolved, recently became a common program.

WM Issue #1

is issue clear? OK

when? clear definition of program by PA. IWAT agrees.

decision is process.

agency participants - 9 members - need to be added to grid.

WM #2

john-could add "and are currently involved in a variety of watershed activities"

when-

pl-additional support is need. is that money or people.

Julie-Judy needs an assistant to help with phone calls and note typing, etc.

john- moved additional support to agency grid.

process, not decision.

penny-CALFED has \$46 m for staff. that's a program management issue. not an art issue.

WM #3

ph-agree to elevate

ph-does CALFED have a role thru this program with things above the watersheds where improvements might be made. some people think we're saying no as far as early implementation, but with poisoning their water supply we are involved.

john-considered part of solution area. but finding connection...difficult linkage to make.

Julie-management team discussed-seemed to concur that water quality as issue for upper watersheds, agreement that there's a link there. less water

cy-should be parallel issue statement for the bay.
who-does this capture
Julie-watershed management isn't just above the dams. need framework for watersheds (goes into bay).
Julie doing paper
Gary-bolster upper watershed, not "too much".
john-there is group that wants focus on upper.
Gary-should reword to say "additional emphasis on upper watershed" or "
ph-"as much emphasis on above as below" balance
Walt-are issues above
Michael - two issues -- 1st is balance --2nd nexus - types of actions that are appropriate for CALFED to look at.
cy-two related questions. understanding nexus gives appropriate scope
who-new issue. this one is to expand upper watershed. new issue is what type of actions for the upper watershed.
cy-new issue of bay. think may be covered under ERP.
this issue ok?
who-should trinity river be included in this?
who-elevate?
cy-why? trinity river said to be out.
cy-trinity is unique problem. but general issue statement - not clear to me why to elevate.
ph-I think Judy is asking for do we want to put additional emphasis on upper watershed or just that ... do we want a solid upper watershed program.
cy-there's work to be done.
whm-doesn't have to be elevated.
Julie-some people on ERP don't see connection. think it's going away.
who-is the ecosystem program considering the upper watershed.
earl-some species don't germinate without forest fires.
john-
ph-is this an issue. yes it is. Julie will write it up. but is it one issue or two. is nexus in this or a separate issue.
Gary-is nexus addressed in #1.
who-action item on issue item. ask for direction - yes you should look at upper watershed, and what kind of actions. so watershed team can start building.
ph-paper should address that
ph-what is the nexus. primarily wq or water supply.
john-policy said find a nexus.
who-does it then need to be elevated or just work to be done.
Julie-get issue paper.
who-concerned that we'll go to mt or pg and they'll say we've already dealt with this.
ph-we may see that there's nothing to be forwarded.
Julie-reading policy agenda-watershed is on policy July agenda.
Julie doing issue paper.
decision: decision.

WM #4
is this an issue?

statement of need.

ph-is she asking for an agency commitment?

who-these aren't Judy's they came from phase ii repot.

john-is there a mechanism in place to make tech assistance available to local groups.

ph-not to forward now. fold into program description.

who-is it ok as is.

by final.

ph-wants something fleshed out for preferred.

Steve-is part of it what type of mechanism needs to be in place.

john-will agencies make tech assistance available to folks in watershed, will it be reliable. will it be coordinated.

ph-and what will it be, how will it be defined.

cy-seems echo of #2. what you need are mechanisms. needs to look more like what's describe in #2.

WM #5

issue sounds like workplan, not issue

ph-should this be consistent with other programs in level of development, or just an add-on.

ph-leave as is.

ph-needs to be a tickler

WM #6

Julie-these issues were brought up before wm was a common program, was part of wq program.

cy-is this statement of who does what accurate. is this CMARP's responsibility vis a vis this program, or is this the watershed management program's response.

Walt-

ph-CMARP is supposed to be making sure we're getting out of the program what we should, and developing what monitoring is needed to ensure that. there will need to be a CMARP link.

john-CMARP has already begun...not sure ... change "develop" to "adopt" re monitoring protocols.

ph-what gets monitored, how, by whom, and how fits into adaptive mgt .

john-one organizational thing-Judy trying to get CMARP involved in tech groups activities.

time-pa

process-

WM #7

process

pa

issue ok

new WM issues

nexus-Michael read

sounded ok as he read

Julie will write paper to elevate

Gary-is that including what activities in upper watershed promote CALFED goals.

earl-the program

working group interagency team - are agencies appropriately represented. working group with stakeholders will work on workplan, actions.

Gary new issue

in ERP, concept of key watersheds. probably more appropriate under ERP.

Julie-defining watershed functions, identifying which are important to CALFED. that's what to focus on. not defined yet. that is an issue-which places are most important.

Gary-there are some watersheds properly functioning. maintain those. those can serve to recede other areas we're trying to restore.

john-haven't really looked at key watersheds in sense of anadromous fish, but in broader context. nexus is good term, ..

Julie-instead of key watersheds, for sierra Nevadas, aquatic diversity management areas. not streams, list of watersheds with certain characteristics (peter moyle?). it exists and CALFED should look at.

who to frame?

Michael read issue. Gary says more along the lines of "watershed management strategy should promote the importance of management of key watersheds."

Julie-scientists have come up with characteristics. already done.

Gary-keep Michael's phrasing. not for more resources to go into, but to preserve intact watersheds.

this will be included in Julie's nexus paper.

Assurances issues, Sue Lurie

who-these are also issues not in phase ii report, based on work that's going on.

sue-Stein is working on strategy. assurances is two components. 1 is separate for each program, 2 is for common across the programs.

majority of stakeholders want new entity for ERP implementation. not with regulatory role?

Sue reviewed the entire list of issues before discussion took place.

when: by final. process.

ph-not ripe. let sue keep working on it.

earl-comment-lack of description is hanging up the finance group. can't finance because don't know what they're buying.

pl-contingency response-is Assurances Work Group really doing all that, can we really expect a product.

ph-yes. they're cranking along.

sue-developing process that will be institutionalized.. principle of durability, program can withstand even catastrophic problems. we have defined characteristics, now defining what the response should be.

Penny-Assurances Work Group is working on process, not technical side. that's supposed to be covered in elements or implementation.

Sue-this is a general process. But programs like conservation strategy, developing inhouse ways of dealing with things. When specific, that takes precedence.

new Assurances issues? none.

Penny-I've been trying to figure out why Rick B, Wendy and I talk past each other. I keep hearing you say we don't need to modify main document, because range of impacts is covered. Unless range no longer valid, main doc can stand. Is my understanding correct?

Rick-yes

Penny- while you've covered the range of impacts that can come from an outcome of for example WUE, however depending on path that WUE program takes to accomplish, I don't think we've covered the impacts for the range of actions. If WUE says 200,000 af from ag, what are the impacts from that over 30 years, and pay for 100% of implementation, then impacts are minimal. If we say tomorrow we need it right now, those impacts are not covered by main doc. So path is extremely critical in NEPA analysis. Until we know program's paths, we don't know impact.

Rick B-theory is you do. there may be places where we don't have the range covered. not rewriting main doc with adjustments but putting them in response to comments.

Penny-that's an issue.

Rick B-need a specific comment

Penny-1. are we only handling this by response to comments or are we revising main doc. that's an issue.

Rick B-that's what program has said before Management Team and Policy Group twice.

Penny-Tom Hagler and I were both pretty shocked at last MT.

Rick B-we'll lay out our decisions and if someone wants to change it that's fine. the problem is the time constraint. can't change main doc and do response to comments both. would need more time or more people to work on them.

earl-what happens with comments on administrative draft not addressed in draft.

whm-need to resubmit. we did our very best. if we missed something, this is the forum. if this document doesn't meet your agency needs, bring up in here.

Patrick L-we don't have time to do that. by 7/1 we'll feel that we missed our chance. may have to do written comments. don't see how we can get to those.

rb-can agencies look at their former comments and check docs. are there some real key issues and let the rest fall into a letter.

pl-here's one. impact analysis is based on modeling that was based on wrong b2 assumptions. we've said it for a year how we thought it should go, and b2 was closer to that than how it was modeled. b2 should be clearly laid out.

earl-you've clarified how to handle previously submitted comments. when does issue of revising main doc vs. only addressing in response doc get made.

whm-we will rewrite for final. the schedule we have is very optimistic.

earl-my concern is we'll recirculate the main with new response doc, flipping back & forth for 90-day comment period.

whm-this has been done, not ideal,

earl-yes, but not on this scale.

rb-appendices will be rewritten, just not main.

earl-not desirable.

ph-i understand time frame. i can deal with it, but what about stakeholders who are truly fearful they'll lose their lifestyle and this isn't user-friendly. people are already upset.

whm-we will rewrite the phase ii report which got biggest circulation.

julie-usfs does something similar. substantive changes are addressed in summary,

rb-if the program changes, we have to re-look at range and possibly adjust. if something new

comes, we recognize we may have to adjust.

walt-preface that we understand its cumbersome, here's a list of changes, refer to where it appears in current and prior documents, goes a long way toward allaying fears of bureaucratic blitz. chapter 4 will become an appendix.

cy-how will ART activities be documented.

whm-all issues will be addressed through changes in the programs. or in agency section of response to comments.

rb-we'll have to make clear what we've done. at least in admin and probably also in public draft.

whm-we need to decide to attempt to bring back main document issues.

agenda notes are on my notepad.

whm- Phase II report will change a great deal

pl-what's our strategy

rb-soehren on point, several people to work on. last two weeks, flurry of activity.

ph-Phase II Report should wait until we see how the issues work out.

rb-this is a good forum to deal with those issues.

whm-bring them, and we'll discuss them later.