

		habitats in parts of the focus area not covered by California Central Valley Wetlands and Riparian GIS
	Staff Team to define	Organize and present impact analysis so that it meets NCCPA requirements for documenting "adequate conservation"
	Staff Team to define	Provide tools so that readers can easily find species-specific information, especially in a form that documents compliance with ESA and CESA
Chapter 6	CDFG	Provide equivalent information about state regs/coverage as appropriate
	UFWS/CDFG	This is all legal; add biological interpretation to discussion
6.1.2	NOAA	Write section describing Candidate Conservation Agreements
6.1.3	USFWS	Identify existing Biological Opinions that could apply to CALFED actions Identify BOs in development: CVPIA mother opinion, where does interim K renewal opinion fit? What does this section need to include? Does the BO for 404 Permitted Projects that May Affect Four Endangered Plant Species on the Santa Rosa Plain, California really fit with CALFED actions.
	CALFED/USFWS	Identify which CALFED actions would be covered by existing BOs
6.1.5	USFWS	Describe all CVPIA programs; include some language about how the programs have been coordinated. Make it clear that CVPIA isn't going to mitigate for impacts caused by CALFED activities. (Need to add statement about CVPIA actions that are being or have been implemented via Category III process)
6.1.6	USFWS	Provide an appropriate process for addressing service-area impacts. List planning efforts that could be plugged in to address service area impacts and refer

reader to --- Kern Valley Floor HCP? Metro Bakersfield? Do we acknowledge Southern California plans?

6.2 USFWS

Provide overall statement of overlap of service area HCPs, activities. Add examples here. CALFED may build on the CVP Conservation Program to address Program effects in CVP and SWP service areas (this needs to be fleshed out - can we cross-reference to text on mitigating service area impacts and explain how we've been synergistic with any other applicable program in the service areas?)

This section needs to clearly state how each of the above-described ongoing processes does or does not relate to the CALFED Program and the MSCS. For example, for the FERC Hydropower Relicensing, what can we say about the interrelationship? Are there any conclusions from DNCT that will eventually be applied to any of the FERC licenses? For all processes, can we make a blanket statement that the CS will either (1) be consistent and not develop duplicative mitigation standards; or (2) will influence a change in the existing process (i.e., existing BOs?)

6.3 USFWS

Write Cumulative Impacts section

Chapter 7

7.4.5 CALFED

Write Funding section

7.4.6 CDFG

Write Assurances section

Chapter 8 USFWS

Complete Monitoring chapter. Is it appropriate to discuss here or in financing? Mitigation monitoring is paid for by action agency—but do they actually do the monitoring or pay into a CMARP compliance program?

Chapter 9 USFWS

Complete Adaptive Management chapter