

CALFED Multi-species Conservation Strategy

Policy Team Meeting Notes

March 22, 1999

3:00 - 5:00 PM

These meeting notes summarize major topics of discussion. The attendance list and a list of upcoming meetings are included at the end of these notes.

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM. Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Service-area Impacts

Mike Spear ask for clarification from USFWS staff about analysis of service-area impacts. Is it done only for new development made possible by the action or is existing development also analyzed? Cay Goude said that both can be considered. For Friant, the analysis of service-area impacts considered on-going maintenance of existing infrastructure and the rotation of retired/fallow farmland. More typically, new development is analyzed. Service-area impacts can also be complicated because of groundwater recharge and water transfers, which make it difficult to track the destination of a particular drop of water.

Mary Scoonover said that the programmatic EIS/EIR analyzes indirect and service-area impacts. However, it is not certain that there will be service-area impacts from CALFED actions. CALFED suggests that the Conservation Strategy provide a process for identifying if there will be service-area impacts when specific actions are analyzed. Also, it is CALFED's position that anyone who benefits from a CALFED action should share in the obligation to implement the EWA, ERP, and mitigation for the service-area impacts of the action. If there are no service-area impacts, then there would be no need to mitigate for them.

One problem is that some water users are likely to argue that if the water contracts aren't changed, there would be no change in impacts. However, it is necessary to look at the actual water use and land development to see what the impacts are.

CALFED staff thinks that the USFWS position paper reads as if CALFED would be responsible for non-CALFED actions because many of the examples were not CALFED actions. USFWS replied that the examples were included at CALFED's request to illustrate how service-area impacts are typically analyzed. They were not included as examples of CALFED actions.

Since CALFED has some problems with the USFWS position paper, Mary Scoonover was asked to prepare a written description of CALFED's proposals. Mary requested that USFWS and CDFG review the Section 7 analysis in the EIS/EIR right away, and notify CALFED if it

CALFED Conservation Strategy

is not adequate.

3. Geographic Scope of Multi-species Conservation Strategy

Ray McDowell has supplied JSA with quad sheets for the reservoir sites that are located outside the 14 EMZs. JSA is developing species lists for each site. Because the habitats identified in the Conservation Strategy are so broad, it is unlikely that new habitats will be introduced. Ray will call JSA to find out if the full quad sheet or the smaller impact area for each reservoir is being used. It would be much better to use the limited area. JSA will produce the preliminary species list by 4/2/99 for inclusion in the administrative draft. The appendices for the new information will be ready by 4/30/99. The species will be identified by reservoir site, so that if a site is screened out, it will be easy to drop the associated suite of species.

It was suggested that it would be helpful to do some quick screening, since some of the sites are clearly unsuitable on biological criteria alone. Steve Ritchie said that if USFWS or CDFG had information about such sites to supply it ASAP and CALFED would act quickly to reduce the number of reservoir sites. Patrick Leonard will be the point person from USFWS for supplying that information to CALFED.

CALFED will not include the groundwater storage sites in the Multi-species Conservation Strategy, since they are too poorly defined at this point.

4. Assurances

No one had reviewed Ron Rempel's paper on assurances. Many questions have been raised, but few conclusions reached. It was agreed that there needs to be a clear description of the linkage between assurances and implementation of certain actions, especially establishing the EWA and carrying out the ERP. This section also needs a discussion about what would cause reinitiation of the consultation. Dana Jacobsen will write that section.

There was a discussion of who will pay for actions beyond the limited public funding available. USFWS and CDFG will require that funding is guaranteed, but normally finding the money is the responsibility of the permit holders. USFWS and CDFG don't dictate how the money is raised.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.

Attendance at 3/22/99 Policy Team Meeting

Dawn Andrews, NOAA GC
Mark Ebbin, B&D/CET (phone)
Michael Fris, USFWS

Cay C. Goude, USFWS
Sandy Goldman, Toyon
Karl Halupka, NMFS (phone)

Marti Kie, CALFED (phone)
Dana Jacobsen, DOI SOL
Jim Lecky, NMFS
Patrick Leonard, USFWS
Ron Rempel, CDFG
Steve Ritchie, CALFED (phone)
Mary Scoonover, AG (phone)
Michael Spear, USFWS
Wayne White, USFWS

Upcoming Meetings

The Staff Team will meet:

Tuesday	March 30, 1999	9 AM to Noon	Resources Building Room 804 Call-in Number (916) 657-4113
Tuesday	April 20, 1999	9 AM to Noon	??
Tuesday	May 11, 1999	9 AM to Noon	??
Tuesday	May 25, 1999	9 AM to Noon	??

The Assurances Subcommittee of the Policy Team will meet:

Wednesday	March 31, 1999	8 - 10 AM	3310 El Camino
-----------	----------------	-----------	----------------

The Policy Team will meet:

Friday	April 2, 1999	9 - 11 AM	Resources Building
Tuesday	April 13, 1999	1 - 3 PM	Resources Building Room 1142??