

DATE: August 31, 1998
TO: Mike Fris - USFWS
FROM: Pete Rawlings
SUBJECT: Conservation Strategy Species Matrix Tables

This memorandum transmits species matrix tables and related information for use in preparation of the draft Conservation Strategy, and briefly describes how these products were developed. Please call if you have questions or have trouble opening any of the enclosed diskettes.

Description of Enclosures

Hardcopies of the following items are enclosed:

- one copy each of 42 species matrix tables (eight additional species matrix tables will be delivered at the September 2, 1998 meeting);
- one table for each CALFED region describing the proposed CALFED actions that were evaluated in preparation of the species matrix tables;
- one table indicating which summary programmatic action outcomes apply to each CALFED region; and
- a table of species matrix table numbers.

diskettes with the electronic files of the deliverables described above and a copy of this cover letter are also enclosed. Table A below summarizes the file contents and software application of each deliverable.

Species Evaluation Approach

The following items summarize key points about our approach to conducting the species evaluations. As noted above, I have included an electronic file of this cover letter in case you wish to use the following information in preparation of the draft Conservation Strategy report.

1. CALFED Programs evaluated for their potential effects on each of the species included the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP), Water Quality Program, and Levee System Integrity Program in the Delta Region and only the ERP in the Bay, Sacramento River, and San Joaquin River Regions. The Water Use Efficiency Program and Watershed Restoration Program were not analyzed because programmatic actions have not yet been

proposed for these programs. The effects of proposed storage and conveyance actions were not evaluated at this time.

2. Only the proposed actions with descriptions that indicated there could be an “on the ground effect” if implemented were evaluated. Actions that were not evaluated were those that resulted in:
 - a feasibility or other type of study;
 - a planning effort;
 - undefined level of “support” for actions implemented by others;
 - water quality monitoring programs; and
 - implementation of other program actions (e.g., an action worded such as “Chinook salmon numbers would increase as a result of implementing all other proposed actions affecting riverine habitats”).
3. Evaluated actions are those described in the March 1998 CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR technical appendices. CALFED’s ERP Access database was prepared using the February 1996 version of the ERP plan. Consequently, we updated the database to exclude actions present in the 1996 ERP plan, but not in the 1998 version, and added actions that are in the 1998 version, but not in the 1996 version. We also entered Water Quality and Levee System Integrity program actions that were evaluated into the ERP actions database. Because the database was only updated to include actions that were evaluated in the species matrix tables, we cannot currently generate an accurate list of actions that are not evaluated in the tables.
4. Summary Programmatic Action Outcome statements were developed to help classify evaluated actions into manageable categories of actions that would likely have a similar ecological effect when implemented. Summary programmatic action outcome statements are described in Table 1 and the regional action tables. The body of actions described in each outcome are not unique in most instances because implementing a particular action may effect multiple outcomes (e.g., setting back levees could include summary outcomes that restore riparian habitat and that restore sediment supply to channels).
5. Species evaluated to determine the potential effects of proposed CALFED actions, with one exception, are species that occur in the Delta Region and are listed under the federal or state Endangered Species Acts (ESA); listed as state rare or fully protected; proposed for listing under the federal ESAs; a candidate for listing under the federal ESA; and/or a species for which CALFED has identified an ERP goal of recovery. The exception was inclusion of Central coastal steelhead Evolutionary Significant Unit, which is present in the

Bay Region, but not the Delta Region.

6. The potential effect of actions on an evaluated species were evaluated for the species entire range within the 14 ERP ecological zones (representing a subset of the four CALFED regions).
7. The geographic scope of the actions evaluated included actions that would be implemented within one or more of the ERP 14 ecological zones (representing a subset of the four CALFED regions).
8. In each species matrix table, only the summary programmatic action outcomes that potentially would have an effect on the species are shown in tables. The full set of outcomes that apply to each region is presented in Table 1. The action codes key back to the action tables for each region.

Table A. Summary of Diskette Contents

<u>Diskette No.</u>	<u>Software Application</u>	<u>Contents</u>
1	Wordperfect 6.1	a. Cover letter b. Table 1 (summary programmatic action outcomes by region) c. Table of contents for species matrices d. Species matrix table numbers - *
2	Wordperfect 6.1	a. Species matrix table numbers - *
2	Wordperfect 6.1	a. Species matrix table numbers - *
2	Wordperfect 6.1	a. Species matrix table numbers - *
2	Microsoft Excell	Programmatic action description tables for the: a. Delta Region b. Bay Region c. Sacramento River Region d. San Joaquin River Region

* Refer to the table of contents for species file names.

cc: Tike Baron - USFWS (w/o enclosures)
Marti Kie - CALFED (w/o enclosures)